



ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;
OR, THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
AND
OTHER WORKS,

OF THE
REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
AND AFTERWARDS RECTOR OF HEADBOURN WORTHY, AND HAVANT,
HAMPSHIRE.

WITH THE QUOTATIONS AT LENGTH, IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES,
AND A BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF THE AUTHOR.

IN NINE VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,
443, WEST STRAND;
& J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1840.



ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;
OR, THE
ANTIQUITIES
OF
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
AND
OTHER WORKS,

OF THE
REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
AND AFTERWARDS RECTOR OF HEADBOURN WORTHY, AND HAVANT,
HAMPSHIRE.

WITH THE QUOTATIONS AT LENGTH, IN THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES,
AND A BIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF THE AUTHOR.

IN NINE VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,
443, WEST STRAND;
& J. H. PARKER, OXFORD.

1840.



CONTENTS

OF

THE FIFTH VOLUME.

BOOK XV.

OF THE *MISSA FIDELIUM*, OR 'COMMUNION-SERVICE.'

CHAPTER I.

Of the Prayers preceding the Oblation.

SECT. I. of the Prayer called, *Διὰ Σιωπῆς*, or 'Silent Prayer,' 1.—II. Of the Prayers called *Διὰ Προσφώνησεως*, or 'Bidding Prayers,' 8.—III. The Form of this Sort of Prayers, in the Constitutions, compared with the Fragments that occur in Chrysostom, and other Writers, 13.—IV. Of the Invocation or Collect, following the Prayers of the People, 19.

CHAPTER II.

Of the Oblations of the People, and other things introductory to the Consecration of the Eucharist.

SECT. I. Of the Customary Oblations which the People made at the Altar, 24.—II. What Persons were allowed to make them, and what not, 26.—III. What Oblations might be received at the Altar, and what not, 33.—IV. The Names of such as made Oblations of any considerable Value, rehearsed at the Altar, 37.—V. The Eucharistical Elements usually taken out of the People's Oblations. And, consequently, no use of Wafers, or Unleavened Bread, 40.—VI. The Use of Wafers, instead of Bread, condemned in their first Original, 44.—VII. Wine, mixed with Water, commonly used in the Ancient Church, 47.—VIII. Of some Heretics, who made Alterations or Additions to the Elements in the Eucharist, 52.—IX. And of others, who rejected the Use of the Sacrament altogether, 53.

CHAPTER III.

Of the Oblation and Consecration-Prayers.

SECT. I. The Form of Thanksgiving and Consecration-Prayers described out of the Constitutions, 54.—II. This Account compared with what is said in other Authors. First, As to the Form of Salutation, "Peace be with you," &c., 69.—III. Secondly, The Kiss of Peace, 75.—IV. Thirdly, Washing of Hands before Consecration, 80.—V. Fourthly, The Deacon's Admonition to all Non-Communicants to withdraw; and to all Communicants to come in Charity and

Sincerity, 81.—VI. Of the 'Fans', or 'Fans' to drive away Insects, 82.—VII. Of the Use of the Sign of the Cross at the Lord's Table, 84.—VIII. Of the usual Preface, called *Sursum Corda*, or the Preparation to the great Thanksgiving, 84.—IX. Of the *Eucharistia*, or 'great Thanksgiving,' properly so called, 86.—X. Of the Use of the *Trisagion*, or 'Seraphical Hymn,' "Holy, Holy, Holy," in this Thanksgiving, 90.—XI. A particular Thanksgiving for the Mercies of God, in the Redemption of Mankind by Christ, 93.—XII. The Form of Consecration always composed of a Repetition of the Words of Institution, and Prayer to God, to sanctify the Gifts by his Holy Spirit, 94.—XIII. After this followed Prayer for the whole Catholic Church, 102.—XIV. More particularly for the Bishops and Clergy, 103.—XV. For Kings and Magistrates, 105.—XVI. For the Dead in General, 106.—XVII. Upon what Grounds the Ancient Church prayed for the Dead, Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, as well as all others, 114.—XVIII. A short Account of the Diptychs, and their Use in the Ancient Church, 123.—XIX. Next to the Dead, Prayer made for the Living Members of that particular Church, and every Order in it, 127.—XX. For those that are in Sickness, Slavery, Banishment, and Proscription, and that travel by Sea or by Land, 128.—XXI. For Enemies and Persecutors, Heretics and Unbelievers, 129.—XXII. For the Catechumens, Energumens, and Penitents, 132.—XXIII. For healthful and fruitful Seasons, 132.—XXIV. For all their absent Brethren, 133.—XXV. Concluding with a Doxology to the whole Trinity, 134.—XXVI. To which the People, with one Voice, answered "Amen," 135.—XXVII. Then followed the Creed, in such Churches as had made it a Part of their Liturgy, 136.—XXVIII. And the Lord's Prayer, 137.—XXIX. Absolution of Penitents immediately before the Lord's Prayer, with occasional Benedictions, 138.—XXX. Benediction after the Lord's Prayer, 139.—XXXI. Of the Deacon's Bidding-Prayer after the Consecration, 140.—XXXII. Of the Form *Sancta Sanctis*, and the Hymn "Glory be to God on High," 143.—XXXIII. Of the Psalm inviting to the Communion, 145.—XXXIV. The Consecration always performed with an audible Voice, 146.—XXXV. And with Breaking of Bread, to represent our Saviour's Passion, 147.

CHAPTER IV.

Of Communicants, or Persons who were allowed to receive this Sacrament, and the Manner of receiving it.

SECT. I. All Persons, except Catechumens and Penitents, obliged to receive the Eucharist, 150.—II. When and how this Discipline began first to relax, 152.—III. When first the Use of *Eulogia* came in, instead of the 'Eucharist,' for such as would not communicate, 154.—IV. The Corruption of Private and Solitary Mass unknown to former Ages, 156.—V. Other Corruptions countenanced some time in the Roman Church, as the *Missa Sicca* and *Nautica*, and those called *Bifaciata* and *Trifaciata*, 163.—VI. The Communion not given to Heretics and Schismatics, without Confession and Reconciliation, 170.—VII. Yet given to Infants and Children, for several Ages, 171.—VIII. Sent to the absent Members of their own, or other Churches, 180.—IX. And to those that were Sick, or in Prison, or under any Confinement, or in Penance, at the Point of Death, 183.—X. The Eucharist sometimes consecrated in private Houses for these Purposes, 186.—XI. And commonly reserved in the Church for the same Use, 188.—XII. And also for Public Use upon some Days when they made no new Consecration. This called '*Missa Præsanctificationum*.' Its Use and Original, 189.—XIII. The Eucharist sometimes reserved in private Men, for daily Participation, 193.—XIV. Yet this never allowed in the Public Service, 195.—XV. A novel Custom noted, or reserving the Eucharist for forty Days, and Inconveniences attending it, 197.—XVI. The Eucharist sometimes given to Energumens, in the Intervals of their Distemper, 199.—XVII. All Men debarred from it, that were guilty of any notorious Crime, of what Rank or Degree soever, 200.—XVIII. The Question of Digamy, or second Marriage, stated. Whether it debarred Men any Time

from the Communion, 201.—XIX. The corrupt Custom of some, who gave the Eucharist to the Dead, censured by the Ancients, 202.—XX. Parallel to which is the Abuse of burying the Eucharist with the Dead, 203.—XXI. The Order of Communicating, 205.—XXII. Some Rules observed for Distinction of Places, 206.

CHAPTER V.

A Resolution of several Questions relating to the Manner of Communicating in the Ancient Church.

SECT. I. That the People were always admitted to receive in both Kinds, 208.—II. That in receiving in both Kinds, they always received the Elements distinctly, and not the one dipped in the other, 218.—III. That the Ancients received sometimes standing, sometimes kneeling, but never sitting, 223.—IV. No Elevation of the Host for Divine Adoration in the Ancient Church for many Ages, till the Rise of Transubstantiation, 229.—V. No Adoration of the Host before the Twelfth or Thirteenth Century, 246.—VI. The People allowed to receive the Eucharist into their own Hands, 254.—VII. Whether the same Custom was observed in delivering it to Women and Children, 258.—VIII. The Eucharist usually delivered to the People with a certain Form of Words, to which they answered, "Amen," 261.—IX. How Novatian and others abused the Communion to wicked Purposes, 263.—X. Proper Psalms for the Occasion usually sung while the People were Communicating, 265.

CHAPTER VI.

Of their Post-Communion Service.

SECT. I. The Communion-Service closed with several Sorts of Thanksgiving. First, The Deacon's Bidding Prayer and Thanksgiving, 269.—II. The Bishop's Thanksgiving, or Commendation of the People to God, 269.—III. The Bishop's Benediction, 271.—IV. The Deacon's Form of dismissing the People with the short Prayer, "Go in Peace," 272.—V. What Account we have of these Prayers in other Writers, 272.—VI. The Thanksgiving always made in the Plural Number by the whole Body of the Church, 275.

CHAPTER VII.

How the Remains of the Eucharist were disposed of; and of their common Entertainment, called Agape, or 'Feast of Charity.'

SECT. I. Some Part of the Eucharist anciently reserved for particular Uses, 278.—II. The rest divided among the Communicants, 278.—III. This Division of the Consecrated Elements a distinct Thing from the Division of the other Oblations, 279.—IV. The Remains of the Eucharist sometimes given to innocent Children, 280.—V. And sometimes burned in the Fire, 281.—VI. The other Oblations partly disposed of in a Feast of Charity. Which all the Ancients reckon an Apostolical Rite accompanying the Communion, 282.—VII. Whether this Feast was before or after the Communion, in the Apostles' Days, 285.—VIII. How observed in the following Ages. The Eucharist commonly received fasting, and before this Feast, except upon some particular Occasions, 287.—IX. These Love-Feasts, at first, held in the Church: but afterwards forbidden by Orders of Councils, 294.—X. How the Christians were at first abused and calumniated by some of the Heathens, but admired and envied by others, upon account of these Feasts of Charity, 296.

CHAPTER VIII.

What Preparation the Ancients required as necessary in Communicants, to qualify them for a worthy Reception.

SECT. I. A general Answer to this Question, by referring to the Professions made by every Christian in Baptism, of Repentance, Faith, and Holy Obedience, 301. — II. What Failings are consistent with this Profession, and a State of Grace, and a continual Preparation for the Communion, 303. — III. What Repentance required for such Failings, 306. — IV. What Crimes unqualified Men absolutely for the Communion, and what sort of Repentance was required for them, 308. — V. Scandalous and Notorious Sinners not to be admitted to Communicate, without giving Satisfactory Evidences of their Repentance, 309. — VI. Whether they required Confession of Private Sins to the Priest as a necessary Qualification for the Communion, 313. — VII. That Preparation consists not in coming to Communion at certain holy Seasons, but in Sanctity and Purity at all Times, 316. — VIII. What Faith is required in Communicants, 321. — IX. What Purity of Soul by Repentance and Obedience. How far Fasting useful or necessary to this Purpose, 324. — X. How necessary Justice and Restitution to a worthy Communicant, 326. — XI. The Necessity of Peace and Unity, 327. — XII. Of Charity and Mercy to the Poor, 330. — XIII. Of Charity in forgiving Enemies, and pardoning Offences, 333. — XIV. Of their Behaviour at the Communion, and afterwards, 339.

CHAPTER IX.

Of frequent Communion, and the Times of celebrating it in the Ancient Church.

SECT. I. All Persons, except Penitents under Censure, anciently obliged to receive the Communion every Lord's Day, by the Canons of the Church, 347. — II. This shewed to be the constant Practice for the three first Ages, 350. — III. The Eucharist celebrated on other Days besides the Lord's Day, in many Churches, 351. — IV. And in some Places every Day, 353. — V. When first it came to be settled to three Times in the Year, 363. — VI. And afterward to once a-Year by the Council of Lateran, 364. — VII. What Attempt was made to restore frequent and full Communions at the Reformation, 365. — VIII. Wherein this is still deficient, and what seems yet necessary to be done, in order to reduce Communion to the Primitive Standard, 367.

BOOK XVI.

OF THE UNITY AND DISCIPLINE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Union and Communion observed in the Ancient Church.

SECT. I. Of the Fundamental Unity of Faith, and Obedience to the Laws of Christ, 369. — II. Of the Unity of Love and Charity, as an essential Part of Christian Obedience, 378. — III. Other Sorts of Unity necessary to the Well-being of the Church, 379. — IV. Among these they reckoned, First, The necessary Use of one Baptism, ordinarily to be administered by the Hands of

a regular Ministry, 381.—V. Secondly, The Unity of Worship, in joining with the Church in Prayers, and Administration of the Word and Sacraments, 388.—VI. Thirdly, The Unity of Subjection of Presbyters and People to their Bishop, and Obedience to all Public Orders of the Church, in Matters of an indifferent Nature, 396.—VII. Fourthly, The Unity of Submission to the Discipline of the Church, 405.—VIII. How different Churches maintained the Communion with one another. First, In Faith, 408.—IX. Secondly, In mutual Assistance of each other, for Defence of the common Faith, 409.—X. Thirdly, In joining in Communion with each other in all Holy Offices, as Occasion required, 410.—XI. Fourthly, In mutual Consent to ratify all legal Acts of Discipline, regularly exercised in any Church whatsoever, 415.—XII. In receiving unanimously the Customs of the Universal Church, and submitting to the Decrees of General Councils, 417.—XIII. Sixthly, In submitting to the Decrees of National Councils, 419.—XIV. No Necessity of a Visible Head to unite all the Parts of the Catholic Church into one Communion, 421.—XV. Nor any Necessity that the whole Church should agree in the same Rites and Ceremonies, which were things of an indifferent Nature, 424.—XVI. What allowance was made for Men who, out of simple Ignorance, brake Communion with one another, 428.—XVII. Of different Degrees of Unity; and that no one was esteemed to be in the perfect unity of the Church, who was not in full Communion with her, 431.

CHAPTER II.

Of the Discipline of the Church, and the various Kinds of it, together with the various Methods observed in the Administration of it.

SECT. I. That the Discipline of the Church did not consist in cancelling or disannulling any Man's Baptism, 435.—II. But in excluding Men from the common Benefits and Privileges consequent to Baptism, 436.—III. This Power originally a mere Spiritual Power, though, in some Cases, the Secular Arm was called in to give its Assistance, 437.—IV. This Assistance never required to proceed so far, as, for mere Error, to take away Life, or shed Blood, 445.—V. The Discipline of the Church deprived no Man of his Natural or Civil Rights; much less the Magistrate of his Power, or Allegiance due to him, 455.—VI. But consisted, First, in Admonition of the Offender, 457.—VII. Secondly, in Suspension from the Communion, called, 'the Lesser Excommunication,' 458.—VIII. Thirdly, In Expulsion from the Church, called, 'the Greater Excommunication,' 'Total Separation,' 'Anathema,' and the like, 461.—IX. This Sort of Excommunication was commonly notified to all other Churches, 464.—X. After which, he that was excommunicated in one Church, was held excommunicate in all Churches, 465.—XI. And avoided also in civil Commerce and outward Conversation: and allowed no Memorial after Death, 472.—XII. The Grounds and Reasons of this Practice, 477.—XIII. No Donations or Oblations allowed to be received from excommunicate Persons, 480.—XIV. No one to marry with excommunicate Heretics, or receive their *Eulogies*, or read their Books; but burn them, 481.—XV. What meant by Delivering unto Satan, 484.—XVI. What by *Anathema Maranatha*: and whether any such Forms of Excommunication were in Use in the Ancient Church, 491.—XVII. Whether Excommunication was ever pronounced with Execration, or devoting the Sinner to Temporal Destruction, 494.

CHAPTER III.

Of the Objects of ecclesiastical Censures, or the Persons on whom they might be inflicted : with a general Account of the Crimes for which they were inflicted.

SECT. I. All Members of the Church, falling into great and scandalous Crimes, made liable to Ecclesiastical Censures, without Exception, 501.—II. Women as well as Men, 502.—III. The Rich as well as the Poor. No Commutation of Penance allowed, nor Friendship, nor Favour, 505.—IV. What Privileges some claimed upon the Intercession of the Martyrs in Prison for them. And how this was answered by Cyprian, 506.—V. Magistrates and Princes subject to Ecclesiastical Censures, as well as any others, 508.—VI. In what Cases the greater Excommunication was forborne for the Good of the Church, 523.—VII. The Innocent never involved among the Guilty, in Ecclesiastical Censures. The Original and Novelty of Popish Interdicts, 537.—VIII. The Danger of Excommunicating Innocent Persons, 541.—IX. No one to be Excommunicated without being first heard, and allowed to speak for himself, 543.—X. Nor without Legal Conviction, either by his own Confession ; or credible Evidence of Witnesses, against whom there was no Exception ; or such Notoriety of the Fact as made a Man liable to Excommunication *ipso facto*, without any formal Denunciation, 544.—XI. Excommunication not ordinarily inflicted upon Minors, or Children under Age, 549.—XII. How Persons were sometimes excommunicated after Death, 551.—XIII. The Censures of the Church not to be inflicted for small Offences, 554.—XIV. What the Ancients meant by small Offences in this Matter, and how they distinguished them from the greater, 555.—XV. Excommunication not inflicted for temporal Causes, 568.—XVI. No Bishop allowed to use it to avenge any private Injury done to himself, 571.—XVII. No Man to be Excommunicated for Sins only in Design and Intention, 573.—XVIII. Nor for Forced or Involuntary Actions, 573.

THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK XV.

OF THE MISSA FIDELIUM, OR 'COMMUNION-SERVICE.'

CHAPTER I.

OF THE PRAYERS PRECEDING THE OBLATION.

SECT. I.—*Of the Prayer called, Διὰ Σιωπῆς, or 'Silent Prayer.'*

WHEN the several orders of the catechumens, penitents, and energumens, were dismissed, which was the completion of the *missa catechumenorum*; then immediately began that part of the service, which is properly called *missa fidelium*, or 'communion-service:' because none but communicants (or at least such of the penitents as had gone through all the stages of repentance, and were now waiting for absolution, called, therefore, συνιστάμενοι, or 'co-standers,') might be present at it. The entrance on this service was made by a mental, or silent prayer, made by the people in private, and thence called εὐχὴ διὰ σιωπῆς, 'the silent prayer;' and εὐχὴ κατὰ διάνοιαν, 'the mental prayer.' This we learn from a canon of Laodicea, which gives a summary account of the whole order of the service of the Church: and, therefore, for our clearer proceeding in this matter, I think it not

improper to put it down entire in this place, as being one of the most remarkable canons in the whole Code, and that which will give great light to the subsequent discourse. The words of the Canon are these: "That after the homily of the bishop, first, the prayer of the catechumens is to be made; and after the catechumens are gone forth, then the prayer for the penitents; and when they have received their benediction by imposition of hands, and are withdrawn, then the three prayers of the faithful are to be made: the first of which is to be performed in silence; the second and third, by the bidding and direction [of the deacon.] After these, the kiss of peace is to be given; presbyters saluting the bishop; and laymen, one another: and then the holy oblation shall be celebrated; those of the clergy only communicating in the chancel."

Some learned persons take 'the prayer in silence,' here to mean no more than prayers made over the communicants by the minister alone, the people not making any responses; and by the prayers called *εὐχαὶ διὰ προσφωνήσεως*, they understand 'prayers made by way of responses,' the minister and people mutually answering one another. But this explication does not come up to the sense of this canon. For, by 'the prayer in silence,' we are here to understand such private prayers, as each particular person made by himself; and by the prayers *διὰ προσφωνήσεως*, 'such prayers as the whole Church made in common,' by the call and admonition of the deacon, who repeated the several forms, directing them what things they were to pray for, to each of which petitions they subjoined their *Κύριε, ἐλέησον*, "'Lord, have mercy,' and grant the petitions we ask;" and then the bishop added the *ἐπίκλησις*, or 'invocation,' which was also called *collecta*, 'the collect,' because

* Conc. Laodic. c. xix. (vol. i. p. 1500.) *Περὶ τοῦ διὺν ἰδίᾳ πρῶτον μετὰ τὰς ἑμιλίαις τῶν ἱσισκόπων, καὶ τῶν κατηχομένων εὐχὴν ἱκετιλιῶσθαι καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξελεῖν τοὺς κατηχομένους, τῶν ἐν μισανοίᾳ τὴν εὐχὴν γίνεσθαι καὶ τούτων προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα, καὶ ὑποχωρησάντων, οὕτως τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐχὰς γίνεσθαι τρεῖς μίαν μὲν τὴν πρῶτην διὰ σιωπῆς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην διὰ προσφωνήσεως πληροῦσθαι, ὡς οὕτως τὴν εἰρήνην δίδωσθαι. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ περιστυρίους δοῦναι εἰς ἱσισκόπων τὴν εἰρήνην, τότε τοὺς λαϊκοὺς τὴν εἰρήνην δίδουαι καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἁγίαν προσφοράν ἱκετιλιῶσθαι, καὶ μόνοις ἔξω εἶναι τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς εἰσέναι εἰς τὸ θυιαστήριον, καὶ ποιωνεῖν.*

it was a collection or repetition of all the prayers of the people. That there were these three sorts of prayers in the ancient Church, is evident from the accounts that are given of each of them. And, first, that there were such private prayers of every particular person by himself, appears not only from this canon, but from several ancient writers. St. Chrysostom takes notice, that some, in these private prayers, spent their time in nothing else but praying for revenge upon their enemies. "Many men," says he,^b "fall prostrate upon the ground, and beat the earth with their foreheads, and shed abundance of tears, and groan bitterly within themselves, stretching forth their hands, and shewing great zeal; and yet use all this fervour and earnestness only against their own salvation. For they pray to God, not for their own offences, they do not beseech him to pardon their own sins; but they spend all this labour against their enemies: which is the same thing as if a man should whet his sword, and then not use it against his adversaries, but thrust it into his own throat. For so these men use their prayers, not to obtain pardon of their own sins, but to accelerate the punishment of their enemies; which, in effect, is to run the sword into their own bowels." A little after, he tells us the very words of their prayers, which were these: "Revenge me of my enemies, O Lord, and shew them that I have a God." By all which it appears, that these were the private prayers of the people, which they might abuse, and not the public prayers of the Church: for the Church never taught her children to curse their enemies, but to bless and pray for

^b Chrysostom. Hom. lviii. de non Evulgandis Peccatis, tom. v. p. 762, A. (hom. lx. p. 681, edit. Francof.) Πολλοὶ πρηνεῖς ἑαυτοὺς βιπτοῦντες, καὶ τῇ μετώπῳ τὴν γῆν σύπτουσιν, καὶ διεμὰ προχέοντες δάκρυα, καὶ πικρὸν κἀπὼθιν στενάζοντες, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνουσιν, καὶ πολλὰν σπουδὴν ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, τῇ διεμότητι ταύτῃ καὶ τῇ προθυμίᾳ κατὰ τῆς οἰκίας κίχρηται σωτηρίας· οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν οἰκίων ἁμαρτημάτων παρακαλοῦσι τὸν Θεόν, οὐδὲ συγγνώμην αἰτοῦσι τῶν πλημμελησάντων αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ τὴν σπουδὴν ταύτην κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν κινεῖσιν ἄσπασαν ταῦτον κινεῖντες, ὥσπερ ἐν εἰ τις τὸ ξίφος ἀκοήσας, μὴ κατὰ τῶν πολυμίων χεῖρτο τῷ ὄπλῳ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτὸ διῆς ὤθει. οὕτω καὶ οὕτω οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀφίστης τῶν οἰκίων ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῆς τιμωρίας τῶν ἐχθρῶν ταῖς ἐχθαῖς κίχρηται ὥστε ἵσθαι, καθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν ξίφος ὠθεῖν . . . ἰδιόκησόν μοι ἐκ τῶν ἐχθρῶν μου δαΐξαι αὐτοῖς, ὅτι Θεὸν ἔχω πᾶν.

them. But in these private prayers, which were designed for confession of sins and deprecation of God's judgments, evil men took liberty to transgress all rules, and gratify their passions by asking revenge upon their enemies. Now, though this was a grand abuse of these private prayers, yet it serves to shew us both what the custom was in the Church's allowance of such prayers, and what, in her designation, was the true use of them. St. Basil, speaking of their vigils, or night-assemblies, intimates as plainly,^c "That they were spent in such private prayers, intermingled with divers sorts of psalmody." And Cassian gives the same account of them, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, as I have shewed at large, in speaking of the daily morning and evening-service, which began with private confession, in the Eastern Churches, mentioned by St. Basil, and ended with public confession, made in the words of the fifty-first Psalm, which was thence called 'the psalm of confession,' or 'the penitential psalm,' for the morning-service.^d But as to the private confessions we are now speaking of, with which the communion-service here begun, we are to note further, that they were not only made by the people in silence by themselves, but by the minister in private also. And the footsteps of this practice remain in some of the oldest liturgies of several Churches, quite different from the present confessions in the Roman Missal: for whereas, now, in the Roman Missal, the confession of sins is made to saints and angels, as well as God, all the Offices, for at least a thousand years after Christ, had their confessions only to God. Thus it is in the forms of confession in Gregory's *Sacramentarium*, and others published by Menardus. And this is that manuscript, which Cardinal Bona so much magnifies in the Queen of Sweden's library, as containing the offices of the old Gallican Liturgy. To shew that these confessions were

^c Basil. Epist. lxi. ad Neocæsar. tom. iii. p. 96. "Ἐπειτα πάλιν ἐπιστρέφοντες ἐνὶ κατάρχῳ τοῦ μίλου, οἱ λοιποὶ ὑπνοῦσι· καὶ οὕτως ἐν τῇ παικίλῃ τῆς ψαλμῆς τὴν νύκτα δινύκνοντες μεταξὺ προσευχόμενοι, ἡμέρας ἤδη ὑπολαμπύουσιν, πάντες κινῇ, ὥς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος, καὶ μιᾶς καρδίας, τὴν τῆς ἰσομολογίας ψαλμὸν ἀναφίρουσι τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἴδια ἑαυτῶν ἱκαστος τὰ ῥήματα τῆς μετανοίας ποιούμενοι. (Vol. ii. 844.)

^d See Book xiii. chap. x. sect. xiii. vol. iv. p. 400.

made only to God, and not to any saints or angels; and withal, that they were particular confessions made by the priest 'only in private,' διὰ σιωπῆς, as the Laodicean Canon words it; I will here transcribe that which Bona gives us out of that ancient MS., as the confession of the Gallican office. It is there called *apologia sacerdotis*,* 'the apology of the priest,' or 'the confession of his sins;' and it runs in these words:—

"O thou most admirable Majesty, and great God, Almighty Father, who art of infinite goodness and power, I, who am a most vile sinner, and condemned by the testimony of my own conscience, do approach thee, and present myself in the sight of thy greatness, before the eyes of thine ineffable majesty, before thy holy face, not without due reverence, yet with great unworthiness and neglect of duty. I do not excuse, but accuse myself unto thee. I confess, I say I confess, the unrighteousness of my impiety, that thou mayest forgive the wickedness of my sin. I confess, that if thou dost not forgive, thou mayest punish me. I confess myself a criminal before thee, and yet I know my amendment is only in words. In words I endeavour to appease thee, but in works I offend thee. I am sensible of my faults, and yet I defer the amendment. Assist me therefore, assist me, O thou ineffable Goodness. Pardon me, pardon me, O most

* Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. i. n. i. Ante tuæ immensitatis conspectum, et ante tuæ ineffabilitatis oculos, O majestas mirabilis, scilicet ante sanctos vultus tuos, magne Deus, et maximæ pietatis et potestatis omnipotens Pater, quamlibet non sine debita reverentia, attamen nulla officii dignitate, vilis admodum peccator accedo, et reus conscientiæ testis adsisto. Accuso me tibi, et non excuso: et coram testibus confiteor injustitiam meam tibi, Domino Deo meo. Confiteor, inquam, confiteor sub testibus injustitiam impietatis meæ, ut remittas impietatem peccati mei. Confiteor, quod nisi remittas, recte me punias. Habes me confitentem reum; sed scio non nisi verbis emendantem. Verbis enim placo, operibus offendo. Culpam sentio, emendationem differo. Subveni ergo, subveni, pietas ineffabilis. Ignosce, ignosce mihi, Trinitas mirabilis. Parce, parce, parce, supplico, Deitas placabilis. Exaudi, exaudi, exaudi me, rogo, his verbis illius Filii tui clamantem, 'Pater, æterne Deus, peccavi in cælum et coram te: jam non sum dignus vocari filius tuus; fac me ut unum de mercenariis tuis.' Et nunc, Pater misericors, unicum misericordiæ tuæ portum, Christo favente peto, ut quod per me vilescit, per illum acceptum ferre digneris; qui vivis et regnas in sæcula sæculorum, Amen.

adorable Trinity. Spare me, spare me, spare me, I beseech thee, O merciful God. Hear me, hear me, hear me, I beseech thee, when I cry, in the words of that prodigal son, 'O Father, eternal God, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee; I am no more worthy to be called thy Son, make me as one of thy hired servants.' And now, merciful Father, I fly to the only refuge and haven of thy mercy under the protection of Christ, that what is vile in me, thou mayest favourably vouchsafe to accept in him, who livest and reignest for ever and ever. Amen."

It is plain here, that as there is no address to either saint or angel in this prayer, so it is a private prayer of the priest alone for himself, whilst the people were likewise employed in making their private confessions to God: which shews us the meaning of that silent prayer spoken of in the Council of Laodicea, which is called 'the first prayer in the entrance of the communion-service.'

All I shall add further here, concerning these private prayers, is to make an observation upon two ancient forms of speech, which have some relation to this matter, and help to confirm it; that is, the forms *silentium indicere* and *orationem dare*, both which are used to denote the custom of bidding the people fall to their private devotions. Sometimes the bishop was used to give the signal, by saying, *Oremus*, 'Let us pray,' and then the people betook themselves to their private devotions; after which the bishop summed up their prayers in a short collect, by way of solemn invocation. Thus Uranius describes the rite, in the Life of Paulinus, bishop of Nola, when he tells us,^f "How a certain bishop went into his throne, and there saluting the people, and being saluted by them again, he then, according to custom, gave the signal for prayer, and afterward summed up their prayers in a collect, and so breathed out his last." Sometimes the deacon gave the signal, and this was called *silentium indicere*. Thus it was in the Gallican Churches, as

^f Uran. Vit. Paulini. Ad ecclesiam processit, et, adscenso tribunali, populum ex more salutavit; resalutatusque a populo, orationem dedit, et collecta orationa Spiritum exhalavit.

Bishop Stillingfleet has observed out of Gregory^s of Tours, and the priest did it by the Mozarabic Liturgy; where he rightly concludes, that this phrase, *silentium indicere*, does not barely signify making the people attentive, but there was a further meaning in it, that they were for a time there to attend to their own private prayers; which he thinks not improbable, on these considerations: 1. Gregory Turonensis saith, in the place before mentioned, ‘that the king took that time to speak to the people, who immediately brake forth into a prayer for the king;’ not that any collect was then read for him, for that was not the proper time for it; but, it being a time of secret prayers, they were so moved with what the king said, that they all prayed for him.’ 2. Among the heathens, when they were bidden *favere linguis*, yet then Brissonius saith,^b “They made their private prayers;” and as the deacon’s commanding silence seems to be much of the same nature, it is not probable that the Christians should fall short of their devotions. 3. The great argument to me, is the small number of collects in the ancient Churches; for the Christians spent a great deal of time in the public service on the Lord’s days [and the Stationary days], (I add also their vigils); but all the other Offices could not take up that time, there being no long extemporary prayers, nor such a multitude of tedious ceremonies in all parts, as the Roman Breviary and Missal introduced; and the Collects of greatest antiquity being very

^s Stillingfleet, Origin. Britan. chap. iv. p. 223, ex Gregor. Turon. lib. vii. c. vii. Gregorius Turonensis saith, that in the Gallican Churches the deacon did *silentium indicere*; and the priest did it by the Mozarabic Liturgy, which Eugenius Roblesius understands only of making the people attentive; which I grant was part of the deacon’s office and design in commanding silence, as appears by several passages in the ancient liturgies, both Greek and Latin. But there was a farther meaning in it; and that the people were for a time there to attend to their own private prayers, appears not improbable to me on these considerations. — Gregorii verba hæc sunt: factum est, ut quadam die Dominica, postquam diaconus silentium populis, ut missæ auscultarentur, indixit, rex conversus ad populum diceret, ‘Adjuro vos, o viri cum mulieribus, ut mihi fidem inviolatam servare dignemini; nec me, ut fratres meos nuper fecistis, interimatis, &c. . . . Hæc eo dicente, omnis populus orationem pro rege fudit ad Dominum.

^b Brisson. de Formulis, pp. 8-11.

few and short, it seems most probable, that a competent part of the time was spent in private devotions: a remainder whereof is still preserved in the Office of ordination of priests in our Church, whereby silence is commanded to be kept for a time, for the people's secret prayers. And the same custom was observed at the bidding of prayers, which was a direction for the people what to pray for, in their private devotions, &c.¹

SECT. II.—*Of the Prayers called Δια Προσφωνήσεως, or 'Bidding Prayers.'*

And this leads us, in the next place, to consider the second sort of prayers mentioned in the Laodicean Canon, which are there styled εὐχαὶ διὰ προσφωνήσεως, which we may English 'bidding prayers:' for they were not only a call to the people to pray, but a direction what particulars they were to pray for. We have a form of this sort of prayer in the Apostolical Constitutions, immediately after the dismission of catechumens and penitents, where it is called προσφωνήσις ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστῶν, 'a direction, or bidding prayer,' for the communicants or believers. It is there ushered in with these words:¹ "Let no one of those that are not allowed, come near. As many as are believers, let us fall upon our knees; let us pray to God through his Christ; let us all intensely beseech God through his Christ." Then follow the several petitions, in this order:—

"Let us pray for the peace and tranquillity of the world, and the holy Churches; that the God of the whole world would grant us his perpetual and lasting peace; and keep us, persevering to the end, in all the fulness of piety and virtue."

¹ Vid. Mat. Parker, Concion. in Obitum Bucerii.

¹ Constitut. Apostol. lib. viii. c. ix. (vol. i. p. 469.) Μὴ τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων προσελθῆναι· ἔσσι πιστοὶ, κλίνωμεν γόνυ· διηθώμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παρακαλίσωμεν.—Cap. x. Προσφωνήσις ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστῶν· Ἰπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ τῆς ὑστάτης τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν διηθώμεν, ὅπως ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς αἰδίων καὶ ἀναφαίρετος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰρήνην ἡμῖν παράσχοιτο, ἵνα ἐν πληροφορίᾳ τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἀρετῆς διατελοῦντας ἡμεῖς συντηρήσῃ· ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀπὸ

“ Let us pray for the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church from one end of the earth to the other ; that the Lord would keep it unshaken and undisturbed with storms and tempests, founded on a rock, to the end of the world.”

“ Let us pray for the holy Church (*παιροικίας*) in this place ; that the Lord of all would grant us grace to pursue his heavenly hope without ceasing ; and that we may render him the continual debt and tribute of our prayers.”

“ Let us pray for the whole episcopate [or company of bishops] under heaven, that rightly divide the word of truth ; and let us pray for James, our bishop, and his Churches.”

“ Let us pray for Clemens, our bishop, and his Churches.”

“ Let us pray for Euodius, our bishop, and his Churches, that the merciful God would preserve them in safety, honour, and length of days, for the benefit of his holy Churches, and grant them a venerable old age in all piety and righteousness.”

“ Let us likewise pray for our presbyters, that God would deliver them from every absurd and wicked thing, and preserve them safe and honourable in their presbytery.”

“ Let us pray for the whole order of deacons and subdeacons in Christ ; that the Lord would keep them unblamable in their ministry.”

πειράτων ἴως πειράτων διηθῶμεν· ὅπως ὁ Κύριος ἄσπιστον αὐτὴν καὶ ἀκλυδώνιστον διαφυλάξῃ καὶ διατηρήσῃ μέχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, τιθιμιλιωμένην ἐπὶ τὴν πίστρεαν· καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἰνῆδρι ἀγίας παροικίας διηθῶμεν, ὅπως καταξίωσῃ ἡμᾶς ὁ τῶν ἔλων Κύριος ἀνιδότως τὴν ἰπουράνιον αὐτοῦ ἱλπίδα μεταδιώκειν, καὶ ἀδιάλειπτον αὐτῇ τῆς δέησις ἀποδιδόναι τὴν ὀφειλὴν· ὑπὲρ πάσης πισσοκῆς τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τῶν ὁρσοτομούντων τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας διηθῶμεν· καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πισσοκόπου ἡμῶν Ἰακώβου καὶ τῶν παροικῶν αὐτοῦ διηθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τοῦ πισσοκόπου ἡμῶν Κλήμειτος καὶ τῶν παροικῶν αὐτοῦ διηθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τοῦ πισσοκόπου ἡμῶν Εὐδίου καὶ τῶν παροικῶν αὐτοῦ διηθῶμεν, ὅπως ὁ οἰκτίρμων Θεὸς χάρισται αὐτοὺς ταῖς ἀγίαις αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαις σώου· ἡγίμους· μακροημεριούντας· καὶ τίμιον αὐτοῖς τὸ γῆρας παρᾶσχηται ἐν ὠσιείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ· καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἡμῶν διηθῶμεν, ὅπως ὁ Κύριος βύσῃται αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀτόπου καὶ ποτηροῦ πρᾶγματος, καὶ σώον καὶ ἔντιμον τὸ πρεσβυτερίον αὐτοῖς παρᾶσχοι· ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας καὶ ὤρησεως διηθῶμεν, ὅπως ὁ Κύριος ἀμιμπτον τὴν διακονίαν αὐτοῖς παρᾶσχηται ὑπὲρ ἀγνωστοῦ· Ψαλτῶν παρᾶσχοι· χερῶν καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν διηθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν συζυγαίαις καὶ τικνογονίαις διηθῶμεν, ὅπως ὁ Κύριος τοὺς πάντας αὐτοὺς ἱλάσῃ· ὑπὲρ ἐννεύχων ὁσίως πᾶρῃουμένων διηθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἐγκρατείᾳ, καὶ ὠλαρείᾳ διηθῶμεν ὑπὲρ

“ Let us pray for the readers, singers, widows, and orphans.”

“ Let us pray for those that live in matrimony and procreation [or education] of children, that God would have mercy upon them all.”

“ Let us pray for the eunuchs that walk in holiness.”

“ Let us pray for those that live in continency [or virginity], and lead a pious life.”

“ Let us pray for those that make oblations in the holy Church, and give alms to the poor.”

“ Let us pray for those that offer their sacrifices and first-fruits to the Lord our God; that the most gracious God would reward them with heavenly gifts, and restore them a hundred-fold in this world, and grant them everlasting life in the world to come; giving them heavenly things for their earthly, and for their temporal things those that are eternal.”

“ Let us pray for our brethren that are newly baptized, that the Lord would confirm and establish them.”

“ Let us pray for our brethren that are afflicted with sickness, that the Lord would deliver them from all their distempers and infirmities, and restore them again in health to his holy Church.”

“ Let us pray for all those that travel by sea or by land.”

“ Let us pray for those that are in the mines, and in banishment, and in prison, and in bonds, for the name of the Lord.”

τῶν περὶφορέοντων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ ποιούντων τοῖς πίνεσι τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας διηθῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τὰς θυσιῶν καὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς προσφερόντων Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν διηθῶν· ὥπως ὁ πανάγαθος Θεὸς ἀμείψῃται αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἰσχυραίοις αὐτοῦ δοξαῖς, καὶ δῶ αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ παρόντι ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐν τῇ μέλλοντι ζοῇ αἰώνιοι, καὶ χαρίσῃται αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ τῶν προσκαίρων τὰ αἰώνια· ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπιγίνωσκον τὸ ἰσχυράκιον ὑπὲρ τῶν νεφρωσάντων ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν διηθῶν, ὥπως ὁ Κύριος στηρίξῃ αὐτοὺς καὶ βεβαιώσῃ· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀβυσσῶσι ἐξισταζομένων ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν διηθῶν, ὥπως ὁ Κύριος ῥύσῃται αὐτοὺς πάσης νόσου καὶ πάσης μαλακίας, καὶ σώσῃς ἀποκαταστήσῃ τῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ὑπὲρ πλείοντων καὶ ἰδοιπορούντων διηθῶν· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μεταλλοῖς, καὶ ἐξορίαις, καὶ φυλακαῖς, καὶ δισμοῖς ὄντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου, διηθῶν· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πικρῇ δουλείᾳ καταπονουμένων διηθῶν· ὑπὲρ ἐχθρῶν καὶ μισούντων ἡμᾶς διηθῶν· ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ἡμᾶς διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου διηθῶν, ὥπως ὁ Κύριος πρᾶξῃ τὸν θυμὸν αὐτῶν διασπιδέσῃ τὴν παῖ

“ Let us pray for our enemies, and those that hate us.”

“ Let us pray for those that persecute us for the name of the Lord : that the Lord would mitigate their fury, and dissipate their anger, conceived against us.”

“ Let us pray for those that are without, and led away with error, that the Lord would convert them.”

“ Let us remember the infants of the Church, that the Lord would perfect them in his fear, and bring them to the measure of adult age.”

“ Let us pray mutually for one another, that the Lord would keep and preserve us by his grace unto the end, and deliver us from the evil one, and from all the scandals of those that work iniquity, and conduct us safe to his heavenly kingdom.”

“ Let us pray for every Christian soul.”

“ Save us, O God, and raise us up by thy mercy.”

It is here to be supposed, that as, in the former prayers for the catechumens and penitents,^k so here, at the end of every petition, the people answered, Κύριε, ἐλέησον, ‘ Lord, have mercy upon them ;’ or, as it is in the close of this prayer, “ Save them, O God, and raise them up by thy mercy.”

Any one that will compare either our litany, or the prayer for the whole state of Christ’s Church, in the beginning of our communion-service, will readily perceive, that there is a near affinity between them and this general form of the ancient Church. We have not so complete a form either in Chrysostom’s genuine works, or any other ancient writer, to compare this with, as we did before in considering the form for the catechumens : but there are two very ancient

ἡμῶν ἐργὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἔξω ὄντων καὶ πταλῶντων διηθῶμεν, ὥπως ὁ Κύριος αὐτοὺς ἱκανοποιήσῃ· τῶν νηπίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας μνημονεύομεν, ὥπως ὁ Κύριος τελειώσας αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ φόβῳ αὐτοῦ εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ἀγάγῃ· ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων διηθῶμεν, ὥπως ὁ Κύριος τηρήσῃ ἡμᾶς καὶ φυλάξῃ σὴ αὐτοῦ χάριτι εἰς τέλος, καὶ ῥύσῃται ἡμᾶς τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν σκανδάλων τῶν ἐργαζομένων τὴν ἀνομίαν, καὶ σώσῃ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡγουρέαν· ὑπὲρ πάσης ψυχῆς Χριστιανῆς διηθῶμεν σωθῆναι καὶ ἀνάστηναι ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς τῷ ἰλίῳ σου.—Vid. lib. ii. c. lvii. Μετὰ ταῦτα προσευχίσθω ὁ διάκονος, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσης, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ μερῶν, καὶ ἐκφοριῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ τῆς καθόλου εἰρήνης.

^k See Book xiv. chap. v. sect. iii. vol. iv. p. 615.

forms of such a prayer, without any addition of invocation of saints, still preserved, one in the Ambrosian Liturgy, and the other in an ancient Office, transcribed by Wicelius out of the library of Fulda; which, because they come near this ancient form in the Constitutions, I will here insert them,¹

¹ In Codice Fuldensi Litanis Missalis.

Dicamus omnes ex toto corde totaque mente: 'Domine, exaudi et miserere.'

Qui respicis terram, et facis eam tremere. 'Oramus te, Domine, exaudi et miserere.'

Pro altissima pace et tranquillitate temporum nostrorum. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Pro sancta ecclesia Catholica, quæ est a finibus usque ad terminos orbis terrarum. 'Oramus te, Domine.'

Pro patre nostro episcopo, pro omnibus episcopis, ac presbyteris, et diaconis, omnique clero. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Pro hoc loco et habitantibus in eo. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Pro piissimo Imperatore et toto Romano exercitu. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Pro omnibus, qui in sublimitate constituti sunt, pro virginibus, viduisque, et orphanis. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Pro pœnitentibus et catechumenis. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Pro his, qui in sancta ecclesia fructus misericordiæ largiuntur. Domine Deus virtutum, exaudi preces nostras. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Sanctorum apostolorum et martyrum memores sumus, ut orantibus eis pro nobis veniam mereamur. 'Oramus te, Domine,' &c.

Christianum ac pacificum nobis finem concedi a Domino comprecamur. 'Præsta, Domine, præsta.'

Et divinum in nobis permanere vinculum caritatis, Dominum comprecamur. 'Præsta, Domine, præsta.'

Conservare sanctitatem ac puritatem Catholicæ fidei, sanctum Deum comprecamur. 'Præsta, Domine, præsta.'

Dicamus omnes, 'Domine, exaudi et miserere.'

Altera Formula ex Vita Ambrosiana in Dominica Prima Quadragesimæ, incipiente Diacono, et Choro respondente.

Divinæ pacis et indulgentiæ munere supplicantes ex toto corde et ex tota mente, precamur te. 'Domine, miserere.'

Pro ecclesia sancta Catholica, quæ heic et per universum orbem diffusa est, precamur te. 'Domine, miserere.'

Pro papa nostro N. et pontifice nostro N. et omni clero eorum, omnibusque sacerdotibus ac ministris, precamur te. 'Domine, miserere.'

Pro famulis tuis, N. imperatore et N. rege, duce nostro, et omni exercitu eorum precamur te. 'Domine, miserere.'

Pro pace ecclesiarum, vocatione gentium, et quiete populorum, precamur te. 'Domine, miserere.'

Pro civitate hac, et conservatione ejus, omnibusque habitantibus in ea, precamur te. 'Domine, miserere.'

in the margin, for the use of the learned reader, out of Pamelius' *Liturgica*, tom. iii. p. 307, and Cardinal Bona's *Rerum Liturgicarum*, lib. ii. c. iv. n. iii., and then see what remains of this ancient prayer we meet with in the undoubted writings of the Fathers: for though none of them gives us the same form entire, yet one may easily perceive, by the near alliance of the fragments that remain, that they all refer to the same original. For there are, both in Chrysostom and other writers, several fragments of such a prayer, and plain intimations, that either this, or a like form, was in use in many Churches; and, therefore, it will not be amiss to collect these references and fragments, before we proceed any further.

SECT. III. — *The Form of this Sort of Prayers, in the Constitutions, compared with the Fragments that occur in Chrysostom, and other Writers.*

St. Chrysostom, in one of his sermons, spoken to the people of Antioch, plainly shews, that they had such a form of bidding-prayer in use in that Church: for he relates some of the petitions of it, which are so like the form in the Constitutions, that he will not judge amiss that thinks, the author of the Constitutions had his form from the same original; whence we are sure St. Chrysostom had his, viz. the liturgy of the Church of Antioch. “For,” says he,^m “when

Pro aëris temperie, ac fructu et fecunditate terrarum, precamur te. ‘Domine, miserere.’

Pro virginibus, viduis, orphanis, captivis, ac pœnitentibus, precamur te. ‘Domine, miserere.’

Pro navigantibus, iter agentibus, in carceribus, in vinculis, in metallis, in exsiliis constitutis, precamur te. ‘Domine, miserere.’

Pro iis qui diversis infirmitatibus detinentur, quique spiritibus vexantur immundis, precamur te. ‘Domine, miserere.’

Pro iis qui in sancta ecclesia tua fructus misericordiæ largiuntur, precamur te. ‘Domine, miserere.’

Exaudi nos, Deus, in omni oratione atque deprecatione nostra, precamur te. ‘Domine, miserere.’

Dicamus omnes, ‘Domine, miserere.’

^m Chrysostom. Hom. ii. de Obscuritate Prophetiarum, tom. iii. p. 946, C. 5, (p. 822, edit. Francof.) Καὶ ἡ πάντες ἀκούοντες τοῦ διακόνου, τοῦτο καλεῖοντες καὶ λέγοντες, Διηβῶμαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τοῦ γέροντος, καὶ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως, καὶ ἰσχυροῦς τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱναῖτων, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπεισεχῶν,

you all, in common, hear the deacon bidding this prayer, and saying, 'Let us pray for the bishop, and for his old age, and for grace to assist him, that he may rightly divide the word of truth,' and for those that are here, and those that are in all the world, you refuse not to do what is commanded you, but offer your prayers with all fervency, as knowing what power there is in common prayer. They that are initiated, know what I say: for this is not yet allowed in the prayer of the catechumens; for they are not yet arrived to this boldness and liberty of speech. But the deacon, who ministers in this office, exhorts you to make prayers for the whole world, and for the Church, extended from one end of the earth to the other, and for all the bishops that rule and govern it; and ye obey with readiness, testifying by your actions that great is the power of prayer, when it is offered up by the people with one voice in the church." Here we may observe, that this was the bidding-prayer; for it was done by the *celeusma*, or 'call and admonition' of the deacon, telling them what they were to pray for. Then, again, that it was a prayer peculiar to the communicants, and used only in the communion-service; for the catechumens were not allowed to join in it. And, further, that the petitions for the whole world; for the Church, over all the earth; for all bishops, wheresoever governing the Church; and, particularly, for the bishop of the place, that "he might live to a good old age, and have the help of God's grace, to enable him rightly to divide the word of truth,"—are the same petitions that occur in the Constitutions; which makes it evident, that these forms of bidding-prayer were then commonly used in the Catholic Church. Chrysostom, in another place, speaks of this same prayer as performed, in common, both by ministers and people, and by both of them in the

οὐ παρατιτέσθαι τοῖς τὸ ἐπίταγμα· ἀλλὰ μὲν ἐκτινίας ἀναφίξετε τὴν εὐχὴν, εἰδότες τῆς ὑμετέρας συνόδου τὴν δύναμιν· ἴσασι οἱ μιμνημένοι τὰ λεγόμενα· τῇ γὰρ εὐχῇ τῶν κατηχουμένων οὐδὲν τοῦτο ἐπιτίτραπται· ἰαυδῇ οὐδὲν πρὸς τὴν παῖρησιν ἴφθασαι ταύτην· ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τῆς μίχρῃ πικρᾶν τῆς γῆς ἐκτεταμένης, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν διακούντων αὐτὴν πιστῶτων ἀπάντων παρακληύοντες ποιῆσαι τὰς διήσεις ὁ ταύταις διακονῶν, καὶ ὑπακούοντι μετὰ εὐθυμίας, ἔργῳ μαρτυροῦντες, ὅτι μεγάλη τῆς εὐχῆς ἡ δύναμις, τῆς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπὸ τοῦ θύμου συμφώνως ἀναφερομένης ἵστί.

posture of kneeling or prostration. For, giving an account of the several prayers of the Church, in which the people bear a part with the minister, he says,^a “ They prayed in common for persons possessed with evil spirits, and for the penitents; and then, after they were excluded who could not partake of the holy table, they made another prayer, in which they all fell prostrate upon the earth together, and all, in like manner, rose up together.” This is a plain reference to that bidding-prayer, before which the deacon commanded all to fall down upon the ground, and make those several petitions in that posture, and then gave the signal to rise again, by saying, Ἀναστῶμεν, ‘ Let us rise,’ as it is worded in the Constitutions. Chrysostom has many other passages, which speak of prayers for the whole state of the Church, for bishops, for the universe, and the public peace: but because these refer more peculiarly to the prayer immediately following the consecration and oblation (where a more solemn commemoration of all states was again made), I will refer the notice of them to the discourse upon that prayer in its proper place.

However, I cannot omit mentioning one remarkable thing more out of St. Chrysostom, relating to this prayer, which is, that this prayer was esteemed so much the common prayer of the people, that the children of the Church were particularly enjoined to bear a part in it. For, in one of his homilies upon St. Matthew, speaking, first, of the prayer for the demoniacs; secondly, of the prayer for the penitents; thirdly, of this prayer for the communicants, he observes,^o “ That the two former were offered by the people alone, as intercessors for mercy for others; but this prayer, which was for themselves, was presented also by the innocent children of the people crying to God for mercy; it being supposed that their innocency and humility, the imitation of which qualifies men for the kingdom of heaven, were good recommendations of their prayers, when they

^a Chrysost. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. p. 873, (p. 673, edit. Francof.) Vid. Græc. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. ix. vol. iv. p. 294.

^o Ibid. Hom. lxxi. al. lxxii. in Matth. p. 624, (p. 768, c. edit. cit.) Vid. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. vii. vol. iv. p. 287.

solemnly implored the Divine mercy;" which plainly shews, that this was a general prayer of all degrees of persons in the Church. We may note further, out of St. Austin, that the universal Church, or the greatest part of it, had such prayers preceding the consecration of the eucharist, which were properly called *precationes*, or *deprecationes*, 'supplications for themselves and others;' and *communis oratio*, 'common prayer,' because they were performed by the common voice of the deacon and people. In one of his epistles,^p he divides the whole service of the Church into these five parts: 1. Singing of psalms. 2. Reading the Scriptures. 3. Preaching. 4. The prayers of the bishops and presbyters. 5. The common-prayers, indicted by the voice or direction of the deacons, which were the bidding-prayers we are now discoursing of: whence we learn the meaning of the deacon's being said, *indicere communem orationem*; that it means not barely 'his commanding them to pray,' but 'his going before them in a form of words, to which they might join their common responses.'

In another epistle^q he divides the communion-service into four parts, according to that division of St. Paul, (1 Tim. ii. 1,) "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men;" taking 'supplications' for these common prayers, made for all men, before the consecration of the elements; and 'prayers,' in the Greek called *εὐχαλ*, for 'the prayers of consecration,' of which the Lord's Prayer was

^p Aug. Epist. cxix. ad Januar. c. xviii. Quando autem non est tempus, (quum in ecclesia fratres congregantur) sancta cantandi, nisi quum legitur, aut disputatur, aut antistes clara voce deprecatur, aut communis oratio voce diaconi indicitur? (Vol. ii. p. 107, D.)

^q Ibid. Epist. lii. ad Paulin. Quæst. v. (p. 386.) Eligo in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis vel pene omnis frequentat ecclesia, ut 'precationes' accipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud, quod est in Domini mensa, incipiat benedici: 'orationes,' quum benedicatur et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminuitur, quam totam petitionem fere omnis ecclesia Dominica Oratione concludit. . . . 'Interpellationes' autem, sive, ut vestri codices habent, 'postulationes,' fiunt, quum populus benedicatur. Tunc enim antistites, velut advocati, susceptos suos per manus impositionem misericordissime offerunt potestati. Quibus peractis, et participato tanto sacramento, 'gratiarum actio' cuncta concludit, quam in his etiam verbis ultimam commendavit apostolus.

one, because the people did then solemnly dedicate themselves to Christ; which is the most common notation of the word εὐχὴ, 'a vow.' By 'intercessions,' he understands the benedictions of the people by imposition of hands, used at that time by the bishops, and other chief ministers, recommending them to the mercy of God; and, by 'thanksgiving,' the doxologies and returns of praise, after the participation was over. So that here we have a plain account of the Church's service, and particularly, that the prayers before the consecration were those solemn addresses which were made chiefly by the deacon and people, and, therefore, were called *communis oratio voce diaconi indicta*, 'the common prayers of the people, enjoined and ordered by the bidding of the deacon.' In another place he mentions some of the particulars then prayed for; for, writing to one Vitalis, of Carthage, who maintained that infidels were not to be prayed for, he urges him with the known practice of the Church. "Dispute then," says he,^r "against the prayers of the Church; and when you hear the priest of God exhorting the people of God, at the altar, to pray for infidels, that God would convert them to the faith; and, for catechumens, that God would inspire them with a desire of regeneration; and, for the faithful, that they may persevere, by his grace, in that wherein they have begun; — mock at these pious words, and say you do not do what he exhorts you to do; that is, that you do not pray to God for infidels that he, would make them believers." Here we see the prayers for the conversion of infidels, and the perseverance of believers, are the same with those that occur in the Constitutions; and, in both places, are said to be done at the bidding or exhortation of the minister.

St. Basil also speaks of these prayers, under the name of κηρύγματα ἐκκλησιαστικά, which is not to be understood of

^r Aug. Epist. cvii. ad Vital. p. 187, (p. 493, b. edit. Basil. 1569. Vol. ii. p. 608, E.) Exsere contra orationes ecclesiæ disputationes tuas, et quando audis sacerdotem Dei ad altare exhortantem populum Dei, orare pro incredulis, ut eos Deus convertat ad fidem; et pro catechumenis, ut eis desiderium regenerationis inspiret; et pro fidelibus, ut in eo quod esse cœperunt, ejus munere perseverent; subsanna pias voces, et dic te non facere quod hortatur, id est, Deum pro infidelibus, ut eos fideles faciat, non rogare, &c.

‘preaching in the church,’ but of these prayers, which the deacon, as the common *κῆρυξ*, or ‘proclaimer’ and director of the service, appointed the people to make for all orders of men in the Church. And so St. Basil himself explains his own meaning; for, writing to a friend in a foreign country, he tells him it was impossible he should forget him in his prayers, unless he should forget the work to which the Lord had appointed him: “For you,” says he,³ “who are, by the grace of God, a believer, remember very well the bidding-prayers of the Church: how we there pray for all our brethren that travel in foreign countries; and for all those that are mustered in the camp; and for those that undertake any brave and bold thing for the name of the Lord; and for all such as shew forth any fruits of the Spirit: for all these we make prayers in the holy Church.” And he tells his friend, “That he, being a person singularly eminent, and in all those capacities, as a traveller, as a warrior, as a confessor, as a virtuous man, was always remembered in the public prayers of the Church.” He mentions no other particulars, because he had no occasion to specify any more but what related to this particular man’s case; but we need not doubt but that there were many other such petitions in the liturgy of the Church of Cæsarea, as there were in those of Antioch, and the African Churches. Cæsarius Arelatensis also speaks of these bidding-prayers, as used in the Gallican Churches; for in one of his homilies to the people he exhorts them,⁴ “That as often as the clergy prayed at the altar, or prayer

³ Basil. Ep. ccxli. (vol. ii. p. 1014, C.) Ἐπιλαβίσθαί δι σου ἐν προσευχαῖς ἀδύνατον· εἰ μὴ πρότερον τοῦ ἔργου ἡμῶν ἐπιλαβώμεθα, εἰς ὃ ἔταξεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος· μέμνησαι γὰρ πάντως τῶν κηρυγμάτων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, πιστὸς ὢν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι· ὅτι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀποδημίαις ἀδελφῶν διόμεθα, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις ἰξταζομένων, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν παρῆρσιαζομένων διὰ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν τοὺς πνευματικοὺς καρποὺς ἐκιδυκνυμένων, ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰς εὐχὰς ποιούμεθα· ὢν πάντως ἐν τοῖς χροίοις, ἧ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πᾶσι νομίζομεν καὶ τὴν σὴν ἐμπειριλαμβάνουσαι τιμωτέρα.

⁴ Cæsar. Arelat. Hom. xxxiv. Rogo vos et admoneo, fratres carissimi, ut quotiescumque juxta altare a clericis oratur, aut oratio diacono clamante indicitur, non solum corda sed etiam corpora inclinetis. Nam dum frequenter sicut oportet, et diligenter attendo, diacono clamante, ‘Flectamus genua,’ maximam partem populi, velut columnas erectas stare conspicio, quod Christianis omnino nec licet, nec expedit.

was enjoined by the bidding of the deacon, they should bow not only their hearts, but their bodies also ; for it was a very irregular thing, and unbecoming Christians, that when the deacon cried out, ‘ Let us bend the knee,’ the greatest part of the people should stand erect, like pillars, as he had observed them to do in their devotions.” Here, though we have none of the particular petitions, yet there is a plain reference to them, and two of the circumstances mentioned ; that is, that they were to be made kneeling, and by the indiction or direction of the deacon.

SECT. IV. — *Of the Invocation or Collect, following the Prayers of the People.*

And, in these circumstances, they differed from the following prayer, made by the bishop or chief minister, which the Greeks called *ἐπίκλησις*, ‘ the invocation,’ and the Latins *collecta*, ‘ the collect,’ because it was the recollection, or recapitulation of the preceding prayers of the people. As the former prayer was said by the deacon and people kneeling, so this was presented by the bishop standing. And, therefore, the deacon was used to say immediately after the former prayer, *Ἐγειρώμεθα*, “ ‘ Let us rise up,’ and, praying earnestly, let us recommend ourselves, and one another, to the living God, by his Christ.” After which, the bishop makes this prayer, as the form runs in the Constitutions : “

“ O Lord Almighty, and most high, thou that dwellest in the highest, thou holy One that retest in thy saints (or holy places), that art without original, the great Monarch of the world ; who, by thy Christ, hast caused thy knowledge to be preached unto us, to the acknowledgment of thy glory and name, which he hath manifested to our understandings ; look down now, by him, upon this thy flock, and deliver it from all ignorance and wicked works. Grant that it may fear thee, and love thee, and tremble before the face of thy

▪ Constitut. Apostol. lib. viii. c. xi. (vol. i. p. 471.) Κύριε παντοκράτορ, ὁψίστι, ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν, ἅγιε ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομινι, ἀναρχε, μόναρχε· ὁ διὰ Χριστοῦ κήρυγμα γνώσεως δὸς ἡμῖν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς σῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, οὗ ἐφανέρωσεν ἡμῖν εἰς κατέληψιν αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν ἴπιδε δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνίόν σου ταῦτο· καὶ λύτρωσαι αὐτὸ πάσης ἀγνοίας, καὶ πονηρᾶς πράξεως· καὶ δὸς φόβον φοβέσθαι σε, καὶ ἀγάπην ἀγαπᾶν σε, καὶ στίλλισθαι ἀπὸ προσώπου δόξης σου

glory. Be merciful and propitious unto them, and hearken to their prayers; and keep them unchangeable, unblamable, and without rebuke: that they may be holy both in body and soul, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that they may be perfect, and none among them deficient or wanting in any respect. O thou their Defender, thou Almighty, that regardest not persons, be thou the help of this thy people, whom thou hast redeemed with the precious blood of thy Christ. Be thou their defence and succour, their refuge and keeper, their impregnable wall, their bulwark, and safety. For no one can pluck them out of thy hand. There is no other God like thee: in thee is our hope and strong consolation. Sanctify them by thy truth: for thy word is truth. Thou that dost nothing out of partiality and favour; thou that canst not be deceived, deliver them from sickness and infirmity, from sin, from all injury and fraud, and from the fear of the enemy, from the arrow that flyeth by day, and the danger that walketh in darkness; and vouchsafe to bring them to eternal life, which is in Christ thy only begotten Son, our God and Saviour; by whom be glory and worship unto thee, in the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, world without end. Amen."

This, I conceive, is of the same nature with that prayer mentioned by the Council of Laodicea,* as the second of of those that are said to be made *διὰ προσωπότητος*: for though the author of the Constitutions distinguishes between the

ἐν μὲν αὐτοῖς γινού, καὶ ἴλιως, καὶ ἰπῆκος ἐν ταῖς προσωπαῖς αὐτῶν· καὶ φύλαξον αὐτοὺς ἀρεπταίους, ἀμύμπτους, ἀνιγκλήτους· ἵνα ᾤσιν ἑγὼ σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ, μὴ ἔχοντες σπῖλον ἢ ῥυτίδα ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων· ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾤσιν ἄρειοι, καὶ μηδὲς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἢ κελοδὲς ἢ ἀτείλής· ἀρωγὴ, δύναμις, ἀπροσωπόληπται· γινού ἀντιλήπτωρ τοῦ λαοῦ σου ταύτου, ὃν ἐξηγόρασας τῷ τιμίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου αἵματι· προστάτης, ἰσχύριος, ταμίης, φύλαξ, τιῆχος ἱερωνότατος, φραγμὸς, ἀσφάλεια· ὅτι ἐκ τῆς σῆς χυρὲς οὐδὲς ἀρεπταί· δύναται· οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι Θεὸς ὡσπερ σὺ ἴτιρος· ὅτι ἐν σοὶ ἡ ὑπομονὴ ἡμῶν· ἀγιάσας αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀληθείᾳ ἐστίν· ἀπροσχώρησι, ἀπαρλόγησι· ῥῦσαι αὐτοὺς πάσης νόσου καὶ πάσης μαλακίας, παντὸς παραπτώματος, πάσης ἰσχυρίας καὶ ἀπάτης, ἀπὸ φόβου ἰσχυροῦ, ἀπὸ βίλους πιστομένου ἡμῶν, ἀπὸ πρᾶγματος ἐν σκότει διαπορευομένου καὶ καταξίωσεν αὐτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ Τίῳ σου τῷ μονογενεῖ, τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Σωτῆρι ἡμῶν· δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα καὶ εὐχα, ἐν ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· Ἀμήν.

* Conc. Laodic. c. xix. cit. supra, sect. i. sub litt. (*) p. 2.

deacon's bidding-prayer and the bishop's invocation, calling the former *προσφώνησις*, and the latter *ἐπίκλησις*; yet they both agreed in several things to distinguish them from the silent prayer that went before. For, first, they were both pronounced audibly by the minister, so as the whole congregation might join with them, either by making responses to every particular petition of the deacon's prayer, or by saying 'Amen' at the conclusion of the bishop's prayer; whereas the silent prayers of the people were such as every man said privately by himself, and might be very different from one another, and sometimes were such as were not fit to be heard, because some men abused this opportunity to pray to God for revenge upon their enemies. 2. Both these prayers were made at the call or admonition of the deacon, and so might have the name of *προσφώνησις*. For he said before the one, 'Let us fall down upon our knees, and pray to God:' and before the other, 'Let us rise and commend ourselves to God;' *Παραθώμεθα ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ*. Whence also this and all such prayers of the bishop had the name of *παραθέσεις*, 'commendations,' because they recommended the people to the mercy and protection of God. As we find in one of the canons of the African Code,^w which made an injunction that no prayers should be used in the Church but such as were authorized by a synod, whether they were prefaces, or commendations, or impositions of hands; lest any prayers contrary to the faith should surreptitiously creep into the Church. Where, as by 'prefaces' are meant certain proper prayers used at the eucharist; and, by 'impositions of hands,' prayers made over the penitents, or people, by way of benediction; so, by 'commendations,' are to be understood partly prayers for the catechumens, and partly these prayers of the bishop for the people, recommending their persons, and prayers, and concerns, to the favour of God. This canon was first made in the Council of Milevis,^x where what

^w Cod. Afric. c. ciii. (vol. ii. p. 1118.) *"Ἡρεσι καὶ τοῦτο, ὅστι τὰς κεινυμένων ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ ἰκισίας, εἴτε προόμιμα, εἴτε παραθέσεις, εἴτε τὰς τῆς χυρᾶς ἐκθέσεις, ἀπὸ πάντων ἐπιτιμῶσθαι, καὶ παντὶ ἄλλῳ κατὰ τῆς πίστεως μηδισοῦσι προτιχθῆναι· ἀλλ' αἱ τινες δέποισι ἀπὸ τῶν συνιστάμενων συνήχθησαν, λιχθήσονται.*

^x Conc. Milevit. c. xii. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 1540, E.)

the Greeks call *παράσεις*, is, by the Latins, called ‘*commendationes*.’ But the more usual name in the Latin Church was *collectæ*, ‘collects,’ because these prayers of the bishop, which, in any part of the service, followed the joint prayers of the deacon and congregation, were both a recollection and recommendation of the prayers of the people. In this sense, Cassian takes the phrase, *colligere orationem*; when speaking of the service in the Egyptian monasteries and Eastern Churches, he says,^y “After the Psalms they had private prayers, which they said partly standing, and partly kneeling: which being ended, he that ‘collected the prayer’ rose up: and then they all rose up together with him; none presuming to continue longer upon the ground, lest he should seem rather to pursue his own prayers, than go along with him who collected the prayers, or closed up all with his concluding collect.” Where, we may observe, that a Collect is taken for the chief minister’s prayer at the close of some part of Divine service, collecting and concluding the people’s preceding devotions. As here, in Cassian, it is the close of the ordinary, or daily morning-service, which was the same as the close of that part of the communion-service, which immediately comes before the consecration; as has been shewed before, in speaking of the daily morning-service, more fully in another place.^z

Parallel to this passage in Cassian, is that of Uranius, where, speaking of one John, bishop of Naples, who died in the celebration of Divine service, he says,^a “He gave the signal to the people to pray; and then, having summed up their prayers in a collect, he yielded up the Ghost.” The Council of Agde,^b in France, made it a standing rule for the Gallican Churches, that after all other things were performed

^y Cassian. Institut. lib. ii. c. vii. (p. 19.) Quum is, qui orationem collecturus est, e terra surrexerit, omnes pariter eriguntur, ita ut nullus remorari præsumat, ne non tam sequutus fuisse illius conclusionem, qui precem colligit, quam suam celebrasse credatur.

^z Book xiii. chap. x.

^a Uran. Vit. Paulin. Populo orationem dedit, et collecta oratione spiritum exhalavit.

^b Conc. Agath. c. xxx. (vol. iv. p. 1388.) In conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos capitella de psalmis dicantur; et plebs, collecta oratione, ad vesperam ab episcopo cum benedictione dimittatur.

in the daily course of morning and evening-service, the bishop should conclude the whole office, *collecta oratione*, 'with his collect,' and dismiss the people with his benediction. From which it appears, that these 'collects,' among the Latins, were the same sort of prayers which the Greeks called *ἐπικλήσεις*, and *παραθέσεις*, 'invocations,' and 'commendations,' with which the bishop concluded the prayers of the deacon and people in each distinct part of Divine service: as we have seen it in the service of the catechumens and penitents, and in the offices for the daily morning and evening-prayer, and here, now, in this part of the communion-service which goes before the consecration. Of which I have nothing more to add, but only a short passage out of St. Austin, who, in his book of the Gift of Perseverance,^c seems plainly to intimate, that it was one petition in this prayer, of common use in the African Churches, to pray for God's grace to enable believers to persevere to the end of their lives. For, writing of the necessity of grace, to guard men against the error of the Pelagians, he puts them in mind of the common prayer of the Church, wherein the priest makes invocation for the faithful, or communicants, in these words, "Grant them grace, O Lord, to persevere in thee unto the end." "And who is there," says he, "that hearing the priest thus praying, dares either in word or thought reprehend him, and is not rather ready, both with a believing heart, and a confessing mouth, to answer 'Amen,' to such a benediction?" It is observable here, 1. That this prayer has the same name which the Greeks gave it in the Eastern Church,—"The invocation of the bishop, or priest, over the faithful." And, therefore, 2dly, That it was a part of the communion-service, where such prayers were only made. 3. That it was not the deacon's bidding-prayer, which had the people's responses to every particular petition, but a prayer to which, in the end, they only answered, 'Amen.' 4. That it was a direct invo-

^c Aug. de Dono Perseverantiæ, c. xxiii. (vol. x. p. 566, A.) Aut quis sacerdotem super fideles Dominum invocantem, si quando dixit, 'Da illis, Domine, in te perseverare usque in finem;' non solum voce ausus est, sed saltem cogitatione reprehendere; ac non potius super ejus talem benedictionem, et corde credente et ore confitente respondit, Amen, &c.

cation of God, by way of benediction, such as the bishop used to make, and not an exhortation to pray, which was the office of the deacon. 5. That the petition, in substance, is the same with that of the bishop's prayer in the Constitutions, "Keep them unchangeable, unblamable, and without rebuke; that they may be perfect, both in body and soul, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that they may be perfect, and none among them be found wanting in any respect." All which circumstances made it highly probable that this prayer, referred to by St. Austin, was the very prayer we are speaking of, as used in the close of the first part of the communion-service in the African Churches. These are the footsteps by which we are to trace the practice of the ancient Church in that part of her devotions, which was appropriated to the communicants or believers only, in the entrance of the communion-service, and which answers to the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church-militant here upon earth, in the beginning of our communion-service.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE OBLATIONS OF THE PEOPLE, AND OTHER THINGS INTRODUCTORY TO THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST.

SECT. I.—*Of the Customary Oblations which the People made at the Altar.*

THE next part of this service was the great thanksgiving, and the consecration of the elements of bread and wine for the eucharist. Which, because they were generally taken out of the oblations which the people made at the altar, it will be necessary to give some account of these oblations, and of the elements of bread and wine taken out of them. It was an ancient custom, derived from apostolical practice, for all communicants, that were of ability, to make their oblations of bread and wine, and sometimes other things, at the altar: out of which both the elements were taken, and a common feast was made for the poor. This the apostle plainly refers

to in that reproof which he gives the Corinthians for their excess (1 Cor. xi. 22): "In eating, every one taketh before others his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken." Justin Martyr takes notice of these oblations, saying,^a "They that are wealthy, and they that are willing, give according as they are disposed; and what is collected, is deposited with the bishop, who, out of it, relieves the orphans and widows, and those that are in sickness, or in want, or in bonds, and strangers, and travellers: in a word, he is the curator of all that are in need." Tertullian gives the like account of this practice in his time, only he distinguishes between the weekly and the monthly collection. "Every one," says he,^b "offers a small alms monthly, or when he will, and as he will, and as he can; for no one is compelled, but makes a voluntary collation. This is our bank for piety. For it is not expended in feasting and drinking, and abusive excesses, but in feeding and burying the poor; in providing for orphans that are bereft of their parents, and aged people, and such as suffer shipwreck, or languish in the mines, or in banishment, or in prison. Only one part of it," he adds, "was spent upon a sober feast of charity, where the poor had a right to feed as well as the rich." St. Cyprian also speaks of this, when he asks a rich woman,^c "How she could think she celebrated the Lord's Supper, who had no respect to the corban? or how she could come into the Lord's house without a sacrifice, and eat

^a Justin. Apol. ii. pp. 98, 99. Οἱ ὑποβοῶντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι, κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἵκαστος τὴν ἰαυτοῦ εἰς βούλῃται δίδωσι καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον, ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λιπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δαίμοσι οὔσι, καὶ τοῖς περιπληρώσι οὔσι ζήνοιο, καὶ ἅπλως πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὔσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται. (Paris. 1742, p. 83, E.)

^b Tertul. Apol. c. xxxix. (Paris. 1664, p. 31, B.) Modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit: nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert. Hæc quasi deposita pietatis sunt. Nam inde non epulis, nec potaculis, nec ingratis voratrinis dispensatur, sed egenis alendis humanisque, et pueris ac puellis re ac parentibus destitutis, jamque domesticis senibus, item naufragis: et si qui in metallis, et si qui in insulis vel in custodiis, ex causa Dei sectæ, alumni confessionis suæ sunt.

^c Cyprian. de Opere et Eleemosynis, p. 203, (p. 141, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Locuples et dives es, et Dominicum celebrare te credis, quæ corbonam omnino non respicis; quæ in Dominicum sine sacrificio venis; quæ partem de sacrificio, quod pauper obtulit, sumis?

part of the sacrifice which the poor had offered?" Parallel to which is that of St. Austin,^d "That a man of ability ought to be ashamed to communicate of another man's oblation:" and, therefore, he exhorts every one to bring their own oblations to be consecrated at the altar.

SECT. II. — *What Persons were allowed to make them, and what not.*

There was a very near alliance, and great affinity, between these oblations and that of the eucharist; and, therefore, as they had the same common name of oblation and sacrifice, so, in many respects, the same rules were observed about them: as, first, that none but actual communicants should have the privilege to offer them; for, in those days, it was a privilege to be allowed to make their oblations, and a sort of lesser excommunication to be debarred from it. They would not receive the oblations of persons that were at enmity or variance with their brethren,^e neither at the altar, nor into the treasury. And this, as Optatus tells us,^f was grounded upon that rule of our Saviour, that no men's gifts should be offered at the altar, but those which were seasoned with peace and reconciliation with their brethren. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift," (Matt. v. 23.) For the same reason, they refused the oblations of noted and known oppressors of the poor, as appears from another canon of the Council of Carthage:^g with which agrees the rule in the

^d Aug. Serm. ccxv. de Tempore. Oblationes, quæ in altario consecrentur, offerte: erubescere debet homo idoneus, si de aliena oblatione communicaverit.

^e Conc. Carth. IV. c. xcix. Oblationes dissidentium fratrum, neque in sacrario neque in gazophylacio recipiantur. (Vol. ii. p. 1207.)

^f Optat. lib. vi. p. 93, (p. 111, edit. Paris. 1679.) Si offers munus tuum ad altare, et ibi recordatus fueris, quod frater tuus habeat aliquid adversum te; relinque ibi munus tuum ante altare, et vade prius, reconciliare fratri tuo: et tunc veniens offeres munus tuum.

^g Conc. Carth. IV. c. xciv. Eorum, qui pauperes opprimunt, dona a sacerdotibus refutanda.

Constitutions,^b that “They should not receive the gifts of a thief or a harlot.” Which is repeated again, with an addition of many other suchlike criminals.ⁱ “A bishop must know whose gifts he ought to receive, and whose not; he shall not receive the gifts of fraudulent ‘hucksters,’ *κάπηλοι*, ‘For a huckster shall not be free from sin.’ (Ecclus. xxvi. 29.) And Esaias speaks of these, when he upbraids Israel, saying, ‘Thy hucksters mix wine with water.’ (So the Septuagint reads it, Esa. i. 22.) ‘Neither shall he receive the oblations of whoremongers: for thou shall not offer to the Lord the hire of a whore’ (Deut. xxiii. 18), nor the oblations of covetous and adulterers; ‘for the sacrifices of such are abomination to the Lord.’ Nor the oblations of such as afflict the widow, and oppress the fatherless, by their power, and fill the prisons with innocent persons, and evil entreat their servants with stripes, famine, and hard bondage, and lay waste whole cities: all such are to be rejected, and their offerings are abominable. He shall also refuse all corrupters, and lawyers that plead for injustice, and makers of idols, and thieves, and unrighteous publicans, and those that use frauds in weight or measure; all soldiers that are false accusers, and not content with their wages, but oppress the poor; all murderers, and hangmen, and unrighteous judges, drunkards, blasphemers, and abusers

^b Constitut. lib. iii. c. viii. (vol. i. p. 314, E.) Οὗτοι γὰρ οἱ ἱερεῖς τῆς αὐτῆς ἡγουσασμὸν δέχονται ποτε, οἷον ἄρπαγος, ἢ πόρνης.

ⁱ Ibid. lib. iv. c. vi. (vol. i. p. 330, B.) Χρὴ δὲ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον εἰδέναι, τίνας ἐφίλει δέχισθαι καρποφορίας, καὶ τίνας οὐκ ἐφίλει φυλακταῖοι γὰρ αὐτῇ πρὸς δόσιν κάπηλοι. “οὐ δικαιοῦσινται γὰρ κάπηλος περὶ [al. ἀπὸ] ἁμαρτίας.” περὶ αὐτῶν γὰρ ποὺ καὶ Ἡσαΐας, οὐκ εἰδὼν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, ἔλεγεν, “οἱ κάπηλοί σου μίσγουν τὸν ὕδωρ.” φυλακταῖοι δ’ αὐτῇ καὶ πόρνοι. “Οὐ προσέσεις γὰρ τῇ Κυρίᾳ μίσθωμα πόρνης.” καὶ ἄρπαγος, καὶ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν ἐπιθυμηταί, καὶ μοιχοί· βδελυκταὶ γὰρ αἱ τούτων θυναὶ παρὰ Θεῷ· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐκβλίσκοντες χήρας, καὶ ἔρποντες καταδυναστεύοντες, καὶ τὰς φυλακὰς πληροῦντες ἀναιτίων, ἢ καὶ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν οἰκίταις πονηρεῖς χροῦμενοι, πληγαῖς φημι καὶ λιμῷ καὶ κακοδουλίᾳ, ἢ καὶ πόλεις ὅλας λυμαινόμενοι· φυλακταῖοι ἴστωσάν σοι, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, καὶ αἱ τούτων προσφοραὶ μυσαραί· παραιτήσῃ δὲ καὶ βδελουροῦς, καὶ ῥήτορας ἀδικίᾳ συναγωνιζομένους, καὶ ἰδωλοποιούς, καὶ κλίπτας, καὶ τιλῶνας ἀδίκους, καὶ ζυγοκρούστας, καὶ δολομίτρας· καὶ στρατιώτην εὐποφάντην, μὴ ἀρκούμενον τοῖς ἑσθίοις, ἀλλὰ τοὺς πίνοντας διασίοινα· φοῖα τι καὶ δῆμον, καὶ δικαστὴν παρόνομον, πρὺμμάτων ἀνατροπῆν, ἀνθρώπων ἐπίβουλον, μαζῶν ἐργάτην, μίθυσον, βλάσφημον, κίναidon, τοπογράφον καὶ πάντα ἐπιπονοῦν πονηρὸν, καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ διαμαχόμενον.

of themselves with mankind; all usurers; and, in a word, every wicked man, that lives in rebellion against the will of God." St. Chrysostom, particularly inveighing against oppressors, who offered alms out of what they had violently taken from others, says elegantly,^k "That God will not have his altar covered with tears; Christ will not be fed with robbery; such sort of sustenance is most ungrateful to him; it is an affront to the Lord to offer unclean things to him; he had rather be neglected, and perish by famine (in his poor members), than live by such oblations. The one, indeed, is cruelty, but the other is both cruelty and an affront. It is better to give nothing, than to give that which is the property of others." What the author of the Constitutions observes of idol-makers, is confirmed by Tertullian, who wrote his whole Book of Idolatry in a manner against them, where, among many other things, he says,^l "They that followed that trade, were not to be admitted into the house of God." And it is very remarkable what St. Ambrose told Valentinian, when he was about to restore the heathen altars, at the intercession of Symmachus, "That if he so far contributed toward the resettlement of idolatry, the Church would no longer receive his oblations. What will you answer," says he,^m "to the priest, when he shall say unto

^k Chrysostom. Hom. lxxxvi. al. lxxxvii. in Matth. p. 722, (p. 802, edit. Francof.) Ἀκούσασι, ὅσοι ἀπὸ φόβου δοκῶσι ὑποτίθαι, καὶ τιμὴν λαμβάνοντες ψυχῶν ἀνθρώπων Ἰουδαῖοι αὐτοὶ αἱ ἐπιμοσύναι, μᾶλλον δὲ Σαταναῖ· εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ νῦν, εἰσὶν, εἰ μὴ οἱ ἰσχυροὶ ἰσχυροὶ ἀπαλλάττονται, ὅτι τοῦ παντὸς ἀπολογισθῆαι νομίζουσι, εἰ δίκαια χρυσίους, ἢ ἱερὰ κατὰ βάλλωσι περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ προφήτης φησὶν, ἰκαλῶντων ἐν δάκρυσι τὸ θυσιαστήριόν μου· εὐ βούλειαι Χριστὸς πλησιεῖα τρέφειν, εὐ δίδωται ταύτην τὴν τροφήν· σὶ τὸν δισπόσιν ὑβρίζεις ἀνάθετα προσάγων αὐτῇ; βίβλιον λιμῶν τηπέμενον περιεργῶν, ἢ τρέφειν ἀπὸ τοιούτων· ἐκείνο ὡμοῦ, τοῦτο καὶ ὑβριστοῦ· βίβλιον μηδὲν δύναι, ἢ τὰ ἄλλα ἰσχυροί. — Ibid. Hom. lxxii. in Joan. p. 466, (ibid. edit. cit.) Ἐπιμοσύναις γὰρ φησὶ, καὶ πίστει ἀποκαθαίρονται ἁμαρτίαι· ἐπιμοσύνη δὲ εὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀδικίας λίγων· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδὲ ἐπιμοσύνη, ἀλλ' ὁμότης καὶ ἀπαρθρωπία· σὶ γὰρ ὅφιλοι ἐκδύσαι ἱερεῖον καὶ ἐκδύσαι ἱερεῖον; ἀπὸ γὰρ οἴκετος τοῦ πρᾶγματος ἀρχομένη δι.

^l Tertul. de Idol. c. v. p. 87, C. Respondebimus ad excusationes hujusmodi artificum, quos nunquam in domum Dei admitti oportet, si quis eam disciplinam norit.

^m Ambros. Epist. xxx. ad Valent. Quid respondebis sacerdoti dicenti tibi, 'Munera tua non querit ecclesia; quia templa gentilium muneribus adornasti. Ara Christi dona tua respuit, quoniam aram simulacris, fecisti.' (Paris. 1836, iv. p. 251.)

you, 'The Church requires not your gifts, because you have adorned the temples of the heathen with your gifts; the altar of Christ refuses your oblations, because you have erected an altar to the idol gods?'" By which it is plain, they rejected the oblations not only of professed idolaters, but all such as were abettors of them, or any ways instrumental in giving aid or encouragement to idolatrous practices. Again, it was a standing rule among them not to admit the oblations of those, who, having a right to communicate, would not stay to participate of the communion. This is expressly ordered by the Council of Eliberis;^a and the rule extended further to all those, that, for any crime or heresy, were excluded from communion by the discipline of the Church, or were not in full communion with her: such as all excommunicate persons, all catechumens, penitents, energumens, and strangers that travelled without commendatory letters, and such of the clergy as, for some lesser offences, were reduced to the communion of strangers. For, as Albaspinæus notes rightly upon that canon, "All these were, in some measure, non-communicants, as not being in the perfect and full communion of the Church." The energumens are particularly specified in the next canon of that Council,^o as persons whose oblations should not be received, nor their names mentioned at the altar, whilst they were actually under the agitation of an evil spirit. And all penitents, whilst they were under discipline, were in the same class; only they had this privilege, that if they chanced to die suddenly whilst they were doing penance, and were desirous to be reconciled, by some canons,^p their oblations were allowed to be received after

^a Conc. Illiber. c. xxviii. (i. 973.) *Episcopus placuit ab eo, qui non communicat, munera non accipere debere.*

^o Ibid. c. xxix. (i. 973.) *Energumenus, qui ab erratico spiritu agitur, hujus nomen neque ad altare, cum oblatione, recitandum, neque permittendum ut sua manu in ecclesia ministret.*

^p Conc. Arelat. II. c. xii. (vol. iv. p. 1012.) *De his, qui in pœnitentia positi vita excesserunt, placuit nullum communionem vacuum debere dimitti; sed pro eo quod honoravit pœnitentiam, oblatio illius suscipiatur.* — Conc. Vasens. I. al. II. c. ii. (vol. iii. p. 1457.) *Pro his, qui, pœnitentia accepta, in bonæ vitæ cursu satisfactoria compunctione viventes, sine communionem inopinato nonnumquam transitu, in agris aut itineribus præveniuntur, oblationem recipiendam, &c.* — Conc. Tolet. XI. c. xii. (vol. vi. p. 553, B.) *De his, qui, accepta pœnitentia,*

death, as a testimony of their reconciliation and admission into the communion of the Church again; except they were of that sort of penitents, to whom the Church thought fit, in the severity of her discipline, to deny all external communion at the hour of death, of which there are many instances in the Councils of Sardica, Eliberis, and others: for, then, their oblations were not received, either living or dying; or else when they had been so careless as not to desire reconciliation at the hour of death; in which case, as Pope Leo says,^q "Their cause was reserved to the judgment of God, in whose hand it was, that their life was not prolonged till they could have the remedy of communion." As to the Church, she did not communicate with those after death, with whom she did not communicate when they were alive. Nay, sometimes they would not receive the oblations of those that died in their communion, if their last act happened to have any thing irregular in it; as appears from a case in Cyprian, who tells us,^r "That it had been determined by an African synod, that no one should appoint any of God's ministers a curator or guardian by his will, because they were to give themselves to supplications and prayer, and to attend only upon the sacrifice and service of the altar; and, therefore, when one Germinius Victor had made Germinius Faustinus, a presbyter of the Church of Furni, guardian or trustee, by his last will and testament, Cyprian wrote to the Church of Furni, that they should make no oblation for him, or name him in the sacrifice of the altar." But, in after ages, this piece of discipline was a little moderated in France; for, by a canon of the second Council of Orleans

antequam reconcilientur, ab hac vita recesserint; quanquam diversitas præceptorum de hoc capitulo habeatur, illorum tamen nos sententias placuit sequi, qui multiplices numero de hujusmodi humanius decreverunt; ut et memoria talium in ecclesiis commendetur, et oblatio pro eorum dedicata spiritibus accipiatur.

^q Leo, *Epist. xcii. ad Rusticum, c. vi.* (*Conc. vol. iii. p. 1407.*) *Horum causa Dei judicio reservanda est, in cujus manu fuit, ut talium obitus non usque ad communionis remedium differretur. Nos autem, quibus viventibus non communicavimus, mortuis communicare non possumus.*

^r Cyprian, *Epist. lxi. al. i. ad Cler. Furnitan. p. 3, (p. 169, edit. Fell. Amst. 1700.)* *Ideo Victor quum contra formam, nuper in concilio a sacerdotibus datam, Geminium Faustinum, presbyterum, ausus sit tutorem constituere, non est quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, &c.*

it was ordered,^a "That if any one died in the communion of the Church, his oblation should be received, though he happened to be slain in some fault, provided he had not laid violent hands upon himself." But this privilege was not allowed the catechumens that died without baptism, because they never were perfectly in the communion of the Church: therefore, Chrysostom says,^t "No mention was ever made of them after death in the prayers of the Church, as was usual for believers, in the oblation or sacrifice of the altar." The only thing that could be done for such, was to give private alms to the poor. If they had not the benefit of baptism, they were to be buried as persons who laid violent hands upon themselves, or fell by the arm of justice, without any solemnity of burial,^u or commemoration at the altar. In short, the oblations of all persons who were not in actual or full communion with the Church, were absolutely rejected; and, therefore, those penitents who had gone through all the stages of discipline, and were now allowed to stay, and hear the prayers with the rest of the faithful, were not yet allowed to make any oblations, as being not yet fully reconciled to the communion of the altar. Upon this account the ancient Canons^x style them *κοινωνοῦντας χωρὶς προσφορᾶς*, 'such as communicated in prayers only, without any oblation.'

^a Conc. Aurel. II. c. xiv. Oblationem defunctorum, qui in aliquo crimine fuerint interempti, recipi debere censemus, si tamen non ipsi sibi mortem probentur propriis manibus intulisse.

^t Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Philipp. p. 1225, (p. 33, edit. Francof.) Πῶς οὐ δυσωπήσομεν ὑπὲρ τούτων τὸν Θεὸν παρακαλοῦντες; ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν περὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει παρελθόντων· οἱ δὲ κατηχούμενοι οὐδὲ ταύτης καταξιοῦνται τῆς παραμυθίας, ἀλλὰ ἀπιστίησινται πάσης τῆς τῶν αὐτῶν βοηθείας, πλὴν μιᾶς τινός· ποίας δὲ ταύτης; ἵνασι πίπῃσιν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν διδόναι.

^u Conc. Bracar. I. al. II. c. xvii. (vol. v. p. 841.) Catechumenis, sine redemptione baptismi defunctis, simili modo, non oblationis sanctæ commemoratio, neque psallendi impendatur officium.

^x Conc. Nic. c. xi. "Ὅσοι οὖν γησίως μεταμίλονται, τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀκρωμένιοις ποιήσουσιν οἱ πιστοὶ, καὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ὑποπισκοῦνται· δύο δὲ ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῇ λαῇ τῶν προσευχῶν. — Conc. Ancy. c. iv. (vol. i. p. 1457.) Περὶ τῶν πρὸς βίαν θυσάντων . . . ἴδοξεν ἱναυτὸν ἀπερᾶσθαι, ὑποπιστεῖν δὲ τρία ἔτη, εὐχῆς δὲ μόνης κοινωνῆσαι ἔτη δύο, καὶ τότε ἰλθῆν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον. — Can. v. Εἰ ἐπλήρωσαν τὸν τῆς ὑποπαιδείας τριετὴ χρόνον, χωρὶς προσφορᾶς διχθήτωσαν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔφαγον, δύο ὑποπιστόντες ἔτη, τῷ τρίτῳ κοινωνησάτωσαν χωρὶς προσφορᾶς. — Can. viii. Οἱ δὲ διῦτεροι καὶ τρίτον θύσαντες μετὰ βίας, τιτρωτίαν ὑποπιστάτωσαν, δύο δὲ ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνησάτωσαν, καὶ τῷ ἰσθμῷ τελείως διχθήτωσαν.

But this was more precisely observed in the beginning of their censures : for if a great delinquent, a heretic, or other excommunicate person, would have given his whole estate to the Church, in such a case they would not accept his oblation. There goes an epistle, under the name of St. Austin, to Count Boniface, wherein he tells him,^γ “ He had forbidden all his clergy to accept the oblation of his house; and interdicted him all communion, till he had done penance for a certain bold attempt, and offered to God, first, the sacrifice of an humble and contrite heart for his error.” The epistle, probably, is not St. Austin’s, but it contains nothing disagreeable to the discipline of those times, when the greatest gift would not be accepted from an emperor, if he were a heretic, or under the censure of excommunication ; as it is clear, not only from what has been observed before out of St. Ambrose’s epistle to Valentian, but from what Gregory Nazianzen says of St. Basil,^α “ That he refused the oblations of the Emperor Valens, because he was a professed enemy of the divinity of Christ, and a furious defender of the Arian heresy.” So Liberius refused the offering of Eusebius, the Arian statesman, under Constantius, as we are told by Athanasius^β and Theodoret,^β who reports the story, with all its

^γ Aug. Epist. vi. ad Bonifac. in Appendice, tom. ii. Oblatio domus tuæ a clericis ne suscipiatur indixi ; communionemque tibi interdico, donec pro hoc facto, corde contrito et humiliato, dignum offeras sacrificium Deo.

^α Nazianz. Orat. xx. de Laud. Basili, p. 351, C. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ δῶρα τῇ θείᾳ θεραπείᾳ προσοικνύν ἴδι, ὃν αὐτοεργὸς ἦν, συνεισιλάβετο δ’ αὐτοῖς, ὥσπερ ἦν ἴσος, ἄδην ὃν, εἰ προσήσεται, τνηκαῦτα τὸ πάθος γνωρίζεται, κ. τ. λ.

^β Athanas. Epist. ad Solitar. p. 832, D. (p. 364, edit. 1698.) Κάκῳτος ταχίως προσδοκῆσας διὰ Λιβερίου πάντας ἔλκειν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, γράφει, καὶ πῖμψι σαδόντα Εὐσεβίου τινα καλούμενον μετὰ γραμμάτων καὶ δώρων, ἵνα τοῖς μὲν δώροις πολακίσῃ, τοῖς δὲ γράμμασιν ἀπειλήσῃ. . . . ἵνα ἐπιδικνύς τὰ δῶρα, παρεκάλει, καὶ χειρῶν ἥπτατο λίγαν, Πάσιθτι βασιλεῖ καὶ ταῦτα δέξαι. ὁ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος λόγῳ πείθων ἰδιδασκε, κ. τ. λ.

^β Theodoret. lib. ii. c. xvi. al. xiii. Ὁ βασιλεὺς κληθέντος Λιβερίου καὶ μὴ μεταστάντος τοῦ λογισμοῦ, εἰπὼν ἐξερισθῆναι εἰς τὴν Βίρειαν τῆς Θράκης ἐκδάντος Λιβερίου, ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀπίστυλε πιντακοσίους ὀλοκοτίνας αὐτῷ εἰς δαπάνας Λιβερίου εἶπαι τῷ κομίσαντι, “ Ἀπὸ λθι, δὲς αὐτὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ χρεῖαν γὰρ ἔχει δοῦναι τοῖς στρατιώταις αὐτοῦ.” ὁμοίως ἡ βασίλισσα ἔπαμψεν αὐτῷ τὰ αὐτά. Λιβερίου εἰπὼν, “ Ἀπόδος αὐτὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ χρεῖαν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἔχει εἰς τὴν τῶν στρατῶν ἐξόδισιν. ἵαν δὲ μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχη ὁ βασιλεὺς, δότω αὐτὰ τῷ Ἀλέξανδρῳ καὶ Ἐπικλήτῳ χρεῖαν γὰρ ἔχουσι τούτων.” ὥς δὲ παρ’ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔλαβεν, Εὐσεβίος ὁ εὐνούχος προσφίρει αὐτῷ ἰτίρους Λιβερίου δὲ εἰπὼν αὐτῷ “ Τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἡρέμωσας, καὶ ὡς καταδίκην ἰλιμοσύνην μοι προσφίρεις ἄπλθι, πρῶτον γινεῖ Χριστιανός.” (Cant. 95, 15.)

circumstances, in this manner: "When Constantius drove Liberius into banishment, because he would not subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius with the Nicene faith, he sent him five hundred 'shillings' (ὀλοχοστίνους) to bear his charges; but Liberius bid the messenger that brought them, return them to the emperor, for his soldiers had more need of them. The empress also sent him the same sum, which he returned to the emperor with a like answer, 'That he might keep them for his own expeditions.' Last of all, when he had refused both the former, Eusebius, the eunuch, was sent to make him another offer. To whom Liberius replied, 'Thou hast hazarded and laid waste the Churches over all the world, and dost thou now offer me an alms, as a condemned criminal? But, go thou first, and learn to become a Christian.'" It is no less remarkable what Tertullian tells us of the Church's treatment of Marcion the heretic, when he was excommunicated with Valentinus for his heresy: "They cast him out, with his two hundred *sestertia*, which he had brought into the church;" they were so far from receiving the gifts of such men, that they rejected them with scorn, as Peter did Simon Magus, "Thy money perish with thee;" or as Abraham rejected the gifts of the King of Sodom, saying, "I will not take from a thread to shoe-latchet: I will not take any thing that is thine, lest thou shouldst say, I have made Abraham rich."

SECT. III.—*What Oblations might be received at the Altar, and what not.*

And as they thus made a distinction in the persons of whom they received, so, secondly, they made a distinction in the oblations themselves, which were to be received. For the most ancient custom was only to offer such things at the altar, as were proper for the service of the altar. To this purpose, there are several canons among those called the Apostolical Canons. One says,^d "No bishop or presbyter,

^c Tertul. de Præscript. c. xxx. (p. 212.) Marcion et Valentinus semel et iterum ejecti: Marcion quidem cum ducentis sestertiis, quæ ecclesiæ intulerat.

^d Canon. Apostol. c. iii. (vol. i. p. 26.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διάταξιν, τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ, προσερίγῃ τινα ἐκ τῶ

under pain of deposition, shall offer any thing in the sacrifice on the altar, contrary to the Lord's command, as honey, milk, or strong beer, instead of wine, or birds, or living creatures, excepting only the first-fruits of corn and grapes in their proper season." Another^e forbids any thing to be brought to the altar besides oil for the lamps, and incense in the time of the oblation. And a third^f orders all other first-fruits to be carried home to the bishops and presbyters, to be divided between them, and the deacons, and the rest of the clergy. Some of the African Canons are to the same purpose. The third Council of Carthage orders,^g "That in the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, nothing else be offered but what the Lord commanded, that is, bread, and wine mingled with water. Nor in the oblation of first-fruits, any thing more be offered, but only grapes and corn." The collections of African Canons, both Greek and Latin, give us this canon a little more at large in these words:^h "Nothing shall be offered in the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, but what the Lord himself commanded, that is, bread, and wine mingled with water. But the first-fruits, and honey, and milk, which is offered on one most solemn day for the mystery of infants, though they be offered at the altar, shall have their own peculiar benedic-

Θεοῦ θυσιαστήριον, ἢ μέλι, ἢ γάλα, ἢ ἀντὶ οἴνου σίκερα, ἢ κατηνδυτὰ, ἢ ὄρευμα, ἢ ζῶά τινα, ἢ ὄσπρια, ὡς παρὰ τὴν διάταξιν, καθαιρείσθω.

^e Can. Apostol. c. iv. Τῷ καιρῷ τῷ δόντι, πλὴν νῶον χιδρων, ἢ στάχυας σίτου, ἢ σταφυλῆς, μὴ ἔξω ἴστω προσάγεισθαι τι πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἔλαιον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν λυχνίαν, καὶ θυμίαμα τῷ καιρῷ τῆς θείας ἀναφορᾶς.

^f Ibid. c. v. Ἡ ἕλλη πᾶσα ὁπώρα εἰς οἶκον ἀποστελλίσθω ἀπαρχὴ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον· ὅθλον δὲ, ὡς ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπιμερίζουσι καὶ τοῖς διακόνις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς.

^g Conc. Carth. III. c. xxiv. (vol. ii. p. 1170.) Ut in sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil amplius offeratur, quam ipse Dominus tradidit, hoc est, panis, et vinum aqua mixtum. Nec amplius in sacrificiis (al. in primitiis) offeratur, quam de uvis et frumentis.

^h Cod. Can. African. c. xxxvii. ap. Crab. tom. i. p. 503, (ap. Labb. tom. ii. p. 1068.) Ἵνα ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις μηδὲν πλὴον τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου προσενχθῇ, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος παρίδων· τοῦτ' ἴστω ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου ὕδασι μιμνησθῆναι· ἀπαρχὴ δὲ ἴστω μέλι, ἴστω γάλα, ὡς ἰσθι, προσφιεσθῶ ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἑθίμῳ εἰς τὸ τῶν νηπίων μυστήριον· εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα γάλα ἐν θυσιαστήριῳ προσφίεται, ὅμως ἰδιῶν ἐχέτω κυρίως εὐλογίαν, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἀγιάσματος τοῦ νυριακοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος διόστασθαι· μηδὲν δὲ πλὴον ἐν ταῖς ἀπαρχαῖς προσφιεσθῶ, ἢ ἀπὸ σταφυλῶν καὶ σίτου.

tion, that they may be distinguished from the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. Neither shall any first-fruits be offered, but only of grapes and corn." Here we see milk and honey was only to be offered on one solemn day, that is, on the great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, which was the most solemn time of baptism; and that for the mystery of infants, that is, persons newly baptized, who were commonly called 'infants,' in a mystical sense, from their new birth, in the African Church; for it was usual to give them a taste of honey and milk immediately after baptism, as has been shewed in a former Book;¹ and, upon that account, an oblation of honey and milk is here allowed to be made for this mystery of infants, which was to be offered and consecrated with a peculiar benediction, that it might not be thought to come in the room of the eucharist. And no other first-fruits are allowed to be offered at the altar, but only grapes and corn, as being the materials of bread and wine, out of which the eucharist was taken. In the time of the Council of Trullo, the offering of milk and honey at the altar was universally forbidden.^k But the oblation of the first-fruits of grapes was still allowed: only, whereas a corrupt custom prevailed in some places, to join them in the same sacrifice with the eucharist, and distribute them together with it to the people, the rule of the African Code is revived, and orders given,^l "That they shall have a distinct consecration, and a distinct distribution, if the people were desirous to eat their first-fruits in the Church." In the meantime, we may observe, that, in other Churches, not only the first-fruits of grapes and corn, but all other things which the people were voluntarily disposed to offer, whether

¹ Book xii. chap. iv. sect. vi. vol. iv. p. 50.

^k Conc. Trul. c. lvii. (vol. vi. p. 1167.) "Οτι οὐ χρὴ ἐν τοῖς θυσιαστηρίοις μέλι καὶ γάλα προσφέρεινθαι.

^l Ibid. c. xxviii. 'Ἐπειδὴ ἐν διαφόροις ἐκκλησίαις μαμαθῆκαμιν, σταφυλῆς ἐν τῇ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσφερομένης κατὰ τι κρατῆσαν ἴθος, τοὺς λειτουργοὺς ταύτην τῇ ἀναιμάκτῳ τῆς προσφορᾶς θυσίᾳ συνάπτοντας, οὕτως ἅμα τῇ λαῶ διατίμειν ἀμφότερα, συνιδόμεν, ὡς μηκίτι τοῦτό τινα τῶν ἱερωμένων ποιῶν ἄλλ' εἰς ζωοποίησιν καὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ἄφισιν τῇ λαῶ τῆς προσφορᾶς μόνως μεταδίδοναι ὡς ἀπαρχὴν δὲ τὴν τῆς σταφυλῆς λογιζομένους προσένειν, ἰδικῶς τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἐυλογησάτας τοῖς αἰτουσὶ ταύτης μεταδίδοναι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ δοτῆρος τῶν καρπῶν εὐχαριστίαν.

money or the like gifts, were received at the altar. For, in France, the first Council of Orleans made it a rule,^m "That of such oblations, one moiety should fall to the bishop, and the other be divided among the rest of the clergy." But it is severely censured by Strabo,ⁿ "As a gross piece of superstition in the Roman Church, that they were used to offer and consecrate a lamb, and eat the consecrated flesh of it, out of a pretended reverence to the immaculate Lamb of God, which was slain for the sins of the world." Photius carries the charge a little higher, and objects to them that they offered it, together with the body of Christ, upon the altar. But this is commonly said to be an aggravation of the thing; and, therefore, is rejected by Cardinal Bona as a

^m Conc. Aurel. I. c. xvi. (c. xiv. ap. Labb. tom. iv. p. 1407.) Antiquos canones relegentes priora statuta credidimus renovanda, ut de his, quæ in altario oblatione fidelium conferuntur, medietatem sibi episcopus vindicet, et medietatem dispensandam sibi secundum gradus clerus accipiat, prædiis de omni commoditate in episcoporum potestate durantibus. — Can. xvii. (c. xv.) De his quæ parochiis in terris, vineis, mancipiis, atque pecuniis, quæcumque fideles obtulerint, antiquorum canonum statuta servantur, ut omnia in episcopi potestate consistent. De his tamen, quæ in altario accesserint, tertia fideliter episcopis deferatur.

ⁿ Strabo, de Rebus Eccles. c. xviii. Unde quorundam simplicium error, de Judaicarum superstitionum seminario natus, et ad nostra usque tempora quædam vetustatis extendens vestigia, jam ex magna parte sapientium studio compressus est. Et sicubi adhuc perniciosæ hujus pestis germen revirescere fuerit comprobatur, mucrone spiritali radicitus est amputandum: illum dico errorem, quo quidam agni carnes in Pascha, juxta vel sub altari eas ponentes, benedictione propria consecrabant, et in ipsa resurrectionis die, ante ceteros corporales cibos de ipsis carnibus percipiebant. Cujus benedictionis series adhuc a multis habetur. Quod quam sit supervacuum, et a sacramentis Christianæ perfectionis abhorrens, facile perspicit, qui veraciter intelligit, quod Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus, et vult epulari non in fermento veteri, sed in azymis sinceritatis et veritatis. — Du Pin says, also, that there is an example of this usage in the life of St. Uldarick, and that both Ratramnus and Æneas Parisiensis wrote in defence of it against Photius; but he says it was not authorized in all the Latin Churches. Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, tom. vii. p. 112: "Valafride Strabon remarque, qu'il y avoit quelques personnes simples, qui consacroient et offroient un agneau à la fête de Pâque. On voit un exemple de cet usage dans la vie de saint Uldaric; et l'on trouve dans l'Ordre Romain une Priere pour la benediction de l'agneau le jour de Pâque: mais ce n'étoit pas un usage commun et autorisé dans toutes les églises Latines. Il y a beaucoup plus de raisonnement dans l'Ouvrage de Ratramne, que dans celui d'Ænéas, qui n'est presque qu'un recueil des passages sur les questions proposées.

slander.* But he owns the fact so far as it is related by Strabo, because the old *Ordo Romanus* has such a form for the consecration of a lamb on Easter-day, and it is agreeable to their present practice. Only he blames Strabo for being too zealous in his censure of this rite, and inveighing against it as a superstitious and erroneous practice. Which only shews how much Bona was inclined to defend the superstitions that were crept into his Church, without any foundation in ancient practice.

SECT. IV. — *The Names of such as made Oblations of any considerable Value, rehearsed at the Altar.*

But I proceed with the practice of the ancient Church, and observe, thirdly, that when their oblations were received, it was usual, in many places, to rehearse the names of such as offered, that a commemoration of them might be made, and prayers and praises be offered to God for them at the altar. I have already had occasion to say something of this custom^p out of St. Cyprian,^q and St. Jerom,^r in speaking of deacons, whose office it was to recite the names. To these, I shall now add some further evidences, both out of these and other writers. Cyprian, in one of his epistles to the Churches of Numidia, speaking of a collection that had been made at

* Nicolai Papæ, Epist. ap. Bar. ad an. 867, n. liii. tom. x. p. 356. Mentiuntur quoque, nos, sicuti per alia ipsorum scripta indicatur, agnum in Pascha, more Judæorum, super altare cum Dominico corpore benedicere et offerre. — Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. viii. n. v. (p. 333.) Inter calumnias adversus ecclesiam Romanam, quas Photius Bulgaria regi, hic Romano pontifici Nicolao misit, una hæc fuit, quod in Paschate more Judaico agnum super altare, simul cum Dominico corpore, offerret et benediceret. Sed hoc putidum mendacium est: quamvis enim Romana ecclesia agni carnibus sacerdotalem benedictionem impertiri sole-ret; non eas tamen aut super altare collocabat, aut simul cum Christi corpore offerebat seu benedicebat. Exstat agni benedictio pro die resurrectionis in Ordine Romano; ipsa enim die agni carnes, sacerdotali benedictione sanctificatas, fideles comede-bant ob reverentiam Christi, agni immaculati, pro nobis occisi: idque olim in ejus figuram, Domino præcipiente, constituit Moyses, tamquam præcipuam Judaici Paschatis cærimoniam. Nimio zelo hunc ritum, tamquam superstitiosum et erroneum, Walafridus Strabo reprehendit; nec video, cur adeo acerbè morem antiquissimum, ab ecclesia approbatum et hodie adhuc vigentem, insectetur, &c.

^p Book ii. chap. xx. sect. v.

^q Cyprian. Ep. ix. al. xvii. *ibid*.

^r Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. *ibid*. et subsequente litt. (v).

Carthage for them, says,^a "He had sent them the names of every brother and sister, that had contributed willingly to so necessary a work (it was to redeem captives), that they might remember them in their prayers, and requite their good work in their sacrifices and solemn supplications; he had also added the names of such of his fellow-bishops as were then present, and had contributed, both in their own names, and the names of their respective Churches; and he had signified the sums that every one gave; that, as the common faith and charity required, mention might be made of them in their supplications and prayers." St. Jerom says the same in another place,^t "That now the names of such as offered were publicly rehearsed; and that which was the redemption of sins, was made matter of praise and glory: and men did not remember the widow in the gospel, whose two mites, cast into the treasury, exceeded all the gifts of the rich, who cast in of their abundance." Some think St. Jerom here reflects upon the practice of the Church," as if he disliked the mentioning of the sums offered; which, they say, without doubt, was a corruption. But they mistake St. Jerom's meaning: for he is not blaming the practice of the Church, but the practice of those who gave out of ostentation and vainglory; and when they were privately guilty of theft or oppression, thought to get esteem and reputation, by giving a little of their ill-gotten goods to the poor; pleasing themselves with the applause of the people, whilst their own consciences must needs lash and torment them, as

^a Cyprian. Epist. lx. al. lxii. ad Episcopos Numidas, p. 147, (p. 274, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Ut fratres nostros ac sorores, qui ad hoc opus tam necessarium promte ac libenter operati sunt, ut semper operentur, in mentem habeatis in orationibus vestris, et eis vicem boni operis in sacrificiis et precibus representetis, subdidi nomina singulorum; sed et collegarum quoque et consacerdotum nostrorum, qui et ipsi, quum præsentes essent, et suo, et plebis suæ nomine quædam pro viribus contulerunt, nomina addidi; et præter quantitatem propriam nostram, eorum quoque summulas significavi et misi: quorum omnium, secundum quod fides et caritas exigunt, in orationibus et precibus vestris meminisse debetis.

^t Hieron. in Jerem. xi. lib. ii. p. 354. Nunc publice recitantur offerentium nomina, et redemptio peccatorum mutatur in laudem: nec meminerunt viduæ illius in evangelio, quæ in gazophylacium duo æra mittendo omnium divitum vicit donaria.

^a Comber, of Liturgies, p. 196.

he expresses it in another place.^v It was fit for them to remember the widow's mites, which were a more acceptable sacrifice to God than the greatest gifts of injustice that they could offer him. So he does not condemn the custom of rehearsing the names of the donors as a corruption, but only the private abuses, that, by the viciousness of men, did sometimes accompany it. St. Chrysostom,^x and the author of the Constitutions,^y have some reference to the same custom: the latter orders the bishop to acquaint the poor, who were their benefactors, that they might pray for them by name. And Cotelierius observes a like passage in the Acts of Cæcilian and Felix, where the form runs thus:^z "Such a one gives so much of his substance to the poor;" for which those Acts appeal to the people's own eyes and ears. When the oblations were thus presented, and the names of the donors rehearsed, then it was usual, in some places, to make a commendatory prayer, by way of oblation to God, antecedent to those eucharistical prayers which were appropriated to the consecration of the eucharist. This may be collected from the epistle of Pope Innocent to Decentius, a neighbouring bishop of Eugubium, where he speaks of such an oblation by a commendatory prayer going before the consecration:^a "Which," he says also, "in the Roman Church, was used

^v Hieron. in Ezech. xviii. Multos conspicimus, qui opprimunt per potentiam, vel furta committunt, ut de multis parva pauperibus tribuant, et in suis sceleribus gloriantur. Publiceque diaconus in ecclesia recitet offerentium nomina: Tantum offert ille; Tantum ille pollicitus est: placentque sibi ad plausum populi, torquente eos conscientia. (Vol. v. p. 209.)

^x Chrysostom. Hom. xviii. in Act. p. 175, (p. 173, edit. Francof.) *ἐλχαὶ καὶ διηκεῖς διὰ τοῦ προσφωτὸς καὶ ἰδέσθην.*

^y Constitut. lib. iii. c. iv. *Λίγους δὲ αὐτοῖς, καὶ τίς ὁ δίδωνας, ἴνα καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ προσέσχωσται.* (i. 307.)

^z Gesta Purgat. Cæciliani et Felic. (ad Calcem Optati, p. 95.) Utique vel audisti vel vidisti, si dictum est pauperibus, Dat et vobis de re sua Lucilla.

^a Innocent. Epist. i. ad Decent. c. ii. De nominibus recitandis, antequam preces sacerdos faciat, atque eorum oblationes, quorum nomina recitanda sunt, sua oratione commendet, quam superfluum sit, et ipse pro tua prudentia recognoscis, ut ejus hostiam necdum Deo offeras, ejus ante-nomen insinues, quamvis illi incognitum sit nihil. Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandæ, ac tunc eorum nomina, quorum sunt oblationes, edicenda, ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur, non inter alia, quæ ante præmittimus, ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris precibus aperiamus. (Conc. ii. 1246.)

to be made before the recital of the names of the offerers, which were not rehearsed till they came to the consecration." But whether such a distinct oblation of the creatures was made in all Churches, seems not so very clear, because other writers, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and the Constitutions, say nothing of it.

SECT. V. — *The Eucharistical Elements usually taken out of the People's Oblations. And, consequently, no use of Wafers, or Unleavened Bread.*

Fourthly, we are to observe upon this head, that so long as the people continued to make oblations of bread and wine, the elements for the use of the eucharist were usually taken out of them ; and, by consequence, so long the bread was that common leavened bread, which they used upon other occasions ; and the use of wafers and unleavened bread was not known in the Church till the eleventh or twelfth centuries, when the oblations of common bread began to be left off by the people. This will seem a great paradox to all who look no further than the schoolmen, and only read their disputes with the Greeks' leavened and unleavened bread, which are fierce enough on both sides, and have little of truth on either : as commonly such disputes evaporate into smoke, and end in bitter and false reproaches ; the Greeks terming the Latins 'Azymites,' for consecrating in *azymis*, that is, 'unleavened bread ;' and the Latins, on the other hand, charging the Greeks with deviating from the example of Christ, and the practice of the ancient Church. I will not enter into the detail of the arguments on both sides, which belongs not to this place ; but only acquaint the reader, that now the most wise and learned men in the Roman Church, who have more exactly scanned and examined this matter, think fit to desert the schoolmen, and maintain, "That the whole Primitive Church, and the Roman Church herself, for many ages, never consecrated the eucharist in any other but common and leavened bread." The first that ventured to break the ice, and confront the schoolmen, was Latinus Latinus, in an epistle to Antonius Augustinus. After him, Sirmondus wrote a particular disquisition upon it, which was

followed and commended by Cardinal Bona;^b who has a long dissertation to establish the opinion, wherein he exposes the prejudices and false argumentations of Thomas Aquinas and the rest of the schoolmen. And though Christianus Lupus^c set himself again, with all his might, to defend the common opinion of the schoolmen against Sirmondus; yet his arguments are of no weight with Schelstrate and Pagi,^d who readily give in to the position of Bona and Sirmondus, as founded upon the justest reasons. The chief argument of the schoolmen is no way conclusive, "That the Primitive Church followed the example of Christ, who celebrated his last supper with unleavened bread." For that was only upon the account of the Passover, when no other but unleavened bread could be used among them. After his resurrection, he probably celebrated in leavened bread, and such as was in common use at all other times, except the time of the Passover. And that the Church always used common bread, appears from the following arguments. 1. That the elements were usually taken out of the oblations of the people, where, doubtless, common bread and wine were offered. 2. It is noted by Epiphanius,^e as a peculiar rite of the Ebionite heretics, that they celebrated in unleavened bread and water only; which plainly argues that the Church did otherwise. 3. The ancients say expressly their bread was

^b Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. xxiii.

^c Lup. Not. in Conc. tom. iii. p. 686.

^d Pagi, Critic. in Baron. an. 313, n. xv. (xviii.) Schelstratius sollicite inquit, cur iis in decretis (Melchiadis et Siricii conf. sub litt. ^b) tam obscure agatur de eucharistia, ut divinari quasi oportuerit, an per fermentum corporis et sanguinis Christi sacramenta intelligerentur. Potuissent enim summi pontifices claris verbis decernere, eucharistiam, quia fermenti instar fidelium unionem fovet, ex consecrata episcopi ad absentes presbyteros transmitti debere. Verum nihil horum, nec Melchiades nec Siricius dicunt, sed sub 'fermenti' nomine totum sacramentum comprehendunt. Neque ipsemet populus aliud quam fermenti nomen sacris donis tribuebat. Horum rationem ex disciplina arcani et occultatione sacrorum mysteriorum, quæ per quinque priora ecclesiæ sæcula in usu fuit, Romani pontifices in decretis, quam fideles in colloquiis, sacramenta eucharistiæ sub fermenti nomine occultarint. Vid. Schelstrat. Disciplin. Arcan. c. vii. part. v. — Grischov.

^e Epiphanius. Hæres. xxx. Ebionit. n. xvi. *Μυστήρια δὲ τοῦ ἑνὸς τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ μέγεθος τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπὸ ἱναυτοῦ εἰς ἱναυτὸν διὰ ἁζύμων, καὶ τὸ ἄλλο μέρος τοῦ μυστηρίου δι' ὕδατος μόνου.*

common bread, such as they made for their own use upon other occasions. To which purpose there is a remarkable story in the life of Gregory the Great,^g of a woman who, when he gave her the eucharist in the usual form of words, "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul," laughed at the form; and, being asked the reason of her so doing, said, "It was because he called that the body of Christ, which she knew to be bread that she had made with her own hands." 4. The ancients are wholly silent as to the use of unleavened bread in the Church. But they many times spake of leavened bread; and sometimes the eucharist is called *fermentum*, 'leaven,' upon that account: as appears from the Pontifical in the Lives of Melchiades,^h and Siricius, and a letter of Pope Innocent, where he says, "It was the custom at Rome to consecrate the *fermentum*, that is, 'the eucharist,' in the mother Church, and send it thence on the Lord's day, to the presbyters in the *tituli*, or 'lesser churches,' that they might not think themselves separated from the bishop's communion." But they did not send it to any country parishes, because the sacraments were not to be carried to places at any great distance. What is here called the consecrated *fermentum*, is, by Baronius and others who tread in the track of the schoolmen, interpreted of the *eulogia*, or *panis benedictus*, 'the bread that was blessed,' for such as did not communicate. But Innocent plainly says, "He meant it of the sacrament which was consecrated by the bishop, and sent to the presbyters for the use of lesser

^g Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iv. c. iv. Tu forte dicis, Meus panis est usitatus, &c.

^h Gregor. Vita, lib. ii. c. xli. Matrona quædam beato Gregorio per stationes publicas missarum solemnia celebranti, solitas oblationes obtulerat. Cui post mysteria traditurus, quum diceret, Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi conservet animam tuam: lasciva subrisit. Ille continuo dexteram ab ejus ore convertens, partem illam Domini corporis super altare deposuit. Expletis vero missarum solemnibus, matronam coram populo inquisivit, quam ob rem corpus Dominicum susceptura ridere præsumserit. At illa diu mussitans, tandem prorupit, 'Quia panem,' inquit, 'quem propriis manibus me fecisse cognoram, tu corpus Dominicum perhibebas.' (iv. 58.)

ⁱ Pontifical. Vit. Melchiadis. Hic fecit, ut oblationes consecratæ per ecclesias ex consecrata episcopi dirigerentur, quod declaratur 'fermentum.' — Id. Vit. Siricii. Hic constituit, ut nullus presbyter missas celebraret per omnem hebdomadam, nisi consecratam episcopi loci designati susciperet declaratam, quod nominatur 'fermentum.'

churches." Which shews that, at that time, even in Rome itself, the eucharist was consecrated in common, or leavened bread. 5. It is observable, that neither Photius, nor any other Greek writer, before Michael Cerularius (an. 1051), ever objected the use of unleavened bread to the Roman Church : which argues, that the use of it did not prevail till about that time: else there is no doubt but Photius would, among other things, have objected this to them. These arguments put the matter beyond all dispute, that the Church, for a thousand years, used no other but common, or leavened bread, in the eucharist; and how the change was made, or the time exactly when, is not easy to determine. But Bona's conjecture is very probable, that it crept in upon the people's leaving off to make their oblations in common bread, which occasioned the clergy to provide it themselves; and they, under pretence of decency and respect, brought it from leaven to unleaven; and, from a loaf of common bread, that might be broken, to a nice and delicate wafer, formed in the figure of a *denarius*, or 'penny,' to represent the pence (as some authorsⁱ about that time will have it), for which our Saviour was betrayed: and then, also, the people, instead of offering a loaf of bread, as formerly, were ordered to offer a penny, which was either to be given to the poor, or to be expended upon something appertaining to the sacrifice of the altar. This is the short history of a great change made insensibly in a matter of small moment, if we consider barely the question about the use of leavened and unleavened bread: for it is very indifferent in itself whether is used, so long as peace is preserved in the Church. But in the conse-

ⁱ Honor. Gemma Animæ, lib. i. c. lxvi. (apud Bonam, lib. i. c. xxiii. n. xi.) Fertur, quod olim sacerdotes a singulis domibus et familiis farinam accipiebant, quod adhuc Græci servant, et inde Dominicum panem faciebant, et quem pro populo offerebant, et hunc consecratum eis distribuabant. Postquam autem ecclesia numero quidem augebatur, sed sanctitate minuebatur, propter carnales statutum est, ut, qui possiat, singulis Dominicis, vel tertia Dominica, vel summis festivitibus, vel ter in anno communicarent. Et quia populo non communicante, non erat necesse panem tam magnum fieri, statutum est, eum in modum denarii formari vel fieri; et ut populus pro oblatione farinæ denarios offerret, pro quibus traditum Dominum recognoscerent, qui tamen denarii in usum pauperum, qui membra sunt Christi, cederent, vel in aliquid, quod ad hoc sacrificium pertinet.

quences and progress of the dispute, it was no small matter : for the East and West divided about it, and the Western Church ran so far into an extreme, as almost to lose the nature of the sacramental element, by introducing a thing that could hardly be called bread, instead of that common staff of life which the Lord had appointed to be the representation of his body, in the eucharist.

SECT. VI. — *The Use of Wafers, instead of Bread, condemned in their first Original.*

There wanted not some discerning and judicious men, in a dark age, who complained of the abuse as soon as it began to be introduced. For Bernoldus, a learned presbyter of Constance, about the year 1089, wrote a book *De Ordine Romano*, wherein he thus reflects upon these wafer-hosts, or oblations :^k “ If no less measure than a handful be found mentioned in all the Old and New Testament ; and nothing ought to be done in the temple of the Lord without measure and reason ; these minute oblations seem not to appertain to Christ or his Church, because they are without measure and reason.” This author was a little too bold and free with the corruptions and abuses of the Roman Church, ever to see the light. But Trithemius mentions the book,^l and gives an honourable character of the author. And Cassander saw it in manuscript, and published this fragment of it in his *Liturgics* ;^m where he also makes a severe reflection upon the

^k Bernold. de Ordine Romano, ap. Cassandrum in Liturgicis, c. xxvii. Manifestum est, cujus mensuræ vel formæ debeant esse sacerdotum oblata, quæ ex pugillo similæ fieri jubentur, et ad speciem coronæ, quod est tortam panis offerre. Mensura pugilli minima est omnium mensurarum, unde possit panis fieri, quæ scilicet mensura legitimo jure constituitur sacerdotibus ad ministerium altaris. Quod si minor mensura quam pugillus non invenitur in tota serie et Veteris et Novi Testamenti, et si nihil omnino debet fieri intra vel extra templum Domini absque mensura et ratione, videntur oblatarum minutia ad Christum et ecclesiam nihil pertinere, quia sunt absque mensura et ratione.

^l Trithem. de Scriptur. Eccles. fol. 66, (fol. 51, b. edit. Basil. 1394, fol.) Bernoldus presbyter ecclesiæ Constantiensis in Suevia natione Teutonicus, vir devotus, et in Scripturis Sanctis studiosus et eruditus. . . . Hic ad utilitatem ecclesiasticæ reipublicæ composuisse dicitur volumen, quod prænotavit, Ordinem Romanum.

^m Cassand. Liturgic. x. c. xxvii. Plura ab eodem auctore alioquin prudenti, pio et ecclesiasticarum traditionum studiosissimo in eam sententiam dicuntur, qui

corruption and vanity of that age, for departing from the ancient practice, and introducing an imaginary sort of bread, which deserved more the name of the shadow than the substance. Which just reflection is repeated from Cassander, not only by Vossius,ⁿ but ingenuously also by Cardinal Bona,^o in his animadversions upon this unwarrantable alteration. Yet some there are who pretend antiquity for this also. Durantus^p thought he had found this wafer-bread in Epiphanius, because he says, the bread was ἄρτος στρογγυλοειδής καὶ ἀναίσθητος,^q which they render, ‘bread of a circular figure, and so minute, that it could hardly be perceived by the senses.’ Whereas it should be rendered, ‘bread of a solid, round, globular figure, without life or sense;’ which yet might represent him, who is all life, and infinite, and incomprehensible. Which agrees well to the character of the eucharistical bread used in Epiphanius’s time, when it was the custom to offer round and whole, solid loaves of bread, but has no relation to the wafer-bread of later ages. Durantus urges further the testimony of Gregory the Great,^r who calls the oblations *oblationum coronas*, ‘crowns of bread;’ which may imply, that they were round loaves of

indignissime tulisse videtur, ætate sua in quibusdam ecclesiis oblatas panis, quæ prisca ecclesiæ consuetudine ad usum sacrificii ad mensam Domini a populo fidei offerebantur, ad imaginem numorum et ad tenuissimam quamdam et levis- simam formam a veri panis specie alienam fuisse redactos : quare per contemtum minutias numulariarum oblatarum appellat, imaginariam et umbratilem levitatem illis tribuit, et indignas esse panis vocabulo pro sua tenuitate, ac propter eas officium atque religionem ecclesiastici officii multum per omnem modum confundi adserit, pluribusque et acerbioribus dictis eas insectatur, quæ omnia ut adscribam, expedire hoc loco non putavi.

ⁿ Voss. Thes. Theol. de Symbolis Cænæ Domin. p. 441, (p. 263, edit. Hagæ Comit. 1658, 4to.)

^o Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xxiii. sect. xi. edit. Paris. 1672, 4to. (sect. xix. p. 279, a. in Oper. Antuerp. 1723, fol.)

^p Durant. de Militibus, lib. ii. c. xxxviii. n. vi. Panis consecrandus in modum denarii formari consuevit. . . . Epiphanius quoque in Anchorato, loquens de pane sacramentali, ait, ‘Videmus, quod neque par, neque simile id sit, vel incarnatæ imagini, vel invisibili Deitati, vel etiam membrorum lineamentis: nam istud rotundæ formæ est.’

^q Epiphanius. Anchorat. n. lvii. ‘Ὁρῶμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἴσόν ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ὅμοιον, οὐ τῇ ἰσότητι, οὐ τῇ ἀοράτῃ, οὐ τῇ Διότῃ, οὐ τοῖς χαρακτηρισμοῖς τῶν μελῶν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ στρογγυλοειδὲς καὶ ἀναίσθητον, ὡς πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν. (ii. 60.)

^r Gregor. Dialog. lib. iv. c. lv. Duas secum oblationum coronas detulit, &c.

bread ; but not, therefore, wafers, unless every thing that is round be a wafer. He adds St. Chrysostom also, but he misquotes him ; for the Greek^s has nothing of what is cited. But he might have added truly Cæsarius, Gregory Nazianzen's brother, who, comparing the natural and the sacramental body of Christ together, says,^t "The one was distinguished into several members ; but the other was round." And Iso the monk,^u who calls the oblations *rotulas panis*, 'rolls of bread,' no doubt from the roundness of their figure : and the sixteenth Council of Toledo,^x which speaks of their rotundity also. But, as Cardinal Bona rightly observes, this rotundity implies 'round loaves of bread,' and not 'round wafers ;' of which there was no use or knowledge in former ages, when they used such loaves of common bread as the people offered, or else such as were prepared particularly for the purpose : yet, still, loaves of bread, not wafers ; and common, or leavened bread, not unleavened ; of which there is not the least intimation given in any part of the Church, for above a thousand years ; as that learned cardinal has proved beyond all exception, to whose diligence we chiefly owe the illustration of this matter, in that curious dissertation of his upon the subject.

^s Chrysostom. Hom. lxxxiii. in Matth. citante Duranto, l. c. Qua igitur re mundiorem esse non oportet eum, qui huic sacrificio participaturus est ? Quos radios solares non deberet excedere manus illa, quæ hanc coronam pertractat.

^t Cæsar. Dialog. iii. Quæst. clxix. (Bibliothec. Patr. Max. tom. v. p. 797, f. edit. Lugd. 1677.) Estque hoc quidem artibus compositum, incedendi vim habens et agendi : illud autem rotundum, non articulatum, inanimatum, sanguine carens, immobile, &c.

^u Iso de Miraculis S. Othomari, c. iii.

^x Conc. Tolet. XVI. c. vi. (vol. vi. p. 1340.) Ad conventus nostri agnitionem delatum est, eo quod, in quibusdam Hispaniarum partibus, quidam sacerdotum, partim nescientia impliciti, partim temerario ausu provocati, non panes mundos et studio præparatos supra mensam Domini in sacrificio offerant ; sed passim, quomodo unumquemque aut necessitas impulerit, aut voluntas coegerit, de panibus suis usibus præparatis crustulam in *rotunditatem* auferant, eamque super altare cum vino et aqua pro sacro libamine offerant. Quod factum nequaquam in sacræ auctoritatis historia uspiam gestum perpenditur.

SECT. VII. — *Wine, mixed with Water, commonly used in the Ancient Church.*

The other part of the sacrament was always wine, and that taken also out of the oblations of the people. Some of the ancient heretics, under the pretence of abstinence and temperance, changed this element into water, and consecrated in water only. These were, some of them, disciples of Ebion, and some the followers of Tatian, commonly called *Hydroparastatæ* and *Aquarii*, from the use of water; and sometimes *Encratitæ*, from their abstaining wholly from flesh and wine. And this seems to have been the ground of their errors, that they thought it universally unlawful to eat flesh, or drink wine. Under this character, they are frequently condemned by Epiphanius,¹ who terms them Encratites, and by St. Austin,² under the name of Aquarians, and by Theodoret,³ who says, “They sprung from Tatian, and were called *Hydroparastatæ*, because they offered water instead of wine; and *Encratitæ*, because they wholly abstained from wine and living creatures.” St. Chrysostom^b calls it the pernicious heresy of those that used only water in their mysteries; whereas our Lord instituted them in wine, and drunk wine at his common table after his resurrection, to prevent the budding of this wicked heresy. The like may be read in Philastrius,^c and long before in Irenæus and

¹ Epiphanius. Hæres. xlvi. Encratit. n. xvi. τὸ ἄλλο μέρος τοῦ μυστηρίου δι' ὕδατος μόνου [τιλοῦσι].

² Aug. de Hæres. c. lxiv. (Antwerp. vol. viii. p. 16, a.) Aquarii ex hoc appellati sunt, quod aquam offerunt in poculo sacramenti, non illud, quod omnis ecclesia.

³ Theodoret. de Fabulis Hæretic. lib. i. c. xx. Τοῦτον (Τατιανὸν) ἔχουσιν ἀρχηγὸν οἱ λεγόμενοι Ὑδροπαραστάται. καὶ Ἐγκρατιταί. Ὑδροπαραστάται δὲ ὀνομάζονται, ὡς ὕδωρ ἀντὶ οἴνου προσφέροντες. Ἐγκρατιταί δὲ, ὡς μήτε οἶνον πίνοντες, μήτε τῶν ἡμψύχων μεταλαμβάνοντες.

^b Chrysostom. Hom. lxxxiii. in Matth. p. 700, (p. 864, edit. Francof.) Τίνος ἵππου οὐχ ὕδωρ ἵππων ἀναστὰς, ἀλλ' οἶνον; ἄλλην αἵρεσιν ποιητὰν προῖόντων ἀνασπῶν· ἰασηδὴ γὰρ τινὲς εἰσι ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὕδατι κεχερημένοι, διπλῆς, ὅτι ἥνικα τὰ μυστήρια παρίδωκεν, οἶνον παρίδωκε, καὶ ἥνικα ἀναστὰς χωρὶς μυστηρίων ψιλλὴν τράπεζαν περιτίθειτο, &c.

^c Philast. de Hæres. c. lxxvii. (c. xxx. in Bibl. Patr. tom. v. p. 709, edit. Lugd. 1677.) Aquarii sic dicti sunt, qui in sacramentis cœlestibus offerunt tantum aquam, non illud, quod ecclesia catholica et apostolica facere consuevit.

Clemens Alexandrinus, not to mention the Council of Trullo,^d or any later writers. But, it is to be observed, that beside these there were another sort of Aquarians, who did not reject the use of wine as simply unlawful, either in itself or in the eucharist; for, in their evening-service, they consecrated the eucharist in wine, but not in their morning-assemblies, for fear the smell of the wine should discover them to the heathen. St. Cyprian gives a long account of these in one of his epistles,^e which is particularly designed against them; from which it also appears, that the custom of the Church then was to use wine mixed with water: and he pleads for both as necessary from the command and example of Christ; adding some other reasons why it should be so, as that the water represents the people, as the wine^f does the blood of Christ; and, when in the cup, the water is mingled with the wine, Christ and his people are united together. “And so,” he says, “in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, water cannot be offered alone, as neither can the wine be offered alone: for if the wine be offered by itself, the blood of Christ begins to be without us; and if the water be alone, the people begin to be without Christ.” The third

— Iren. lib. v. c. i. Reprobant hi (Ebionæi) commixtionem vini cœlestis, et solam aquam sæcularem volunt esse. — Clem. Alex. Stromat. lib. i. p. 375. Εἰσὶν οἱ καὶ ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσι. — Id. Pædag. lib. ii. c. ii. p. 186, “Ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθῆναι, ἀπιδιδῶσι πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λίγυν· Ὅδ μὴ τίς ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμαρτίας ταύτης, κ. τ. λ. . . . Τοῦτ’ ἂν μὴν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἐγκρασιτὰς καλουμένους παραπιστήχθω.

^d Conc. Trul. c. xxxii. Τῆς γὰρ σονηρᾶς τῶν Ὑδροπαραστατῶν αἰρίσις παλαιᾶς ὑπαρχούσης, οἱ ἀντὶ οἶνου μόνῳ τῇ ὕδατι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ θυσιὰ κίχρηται. (vi. 1158.)

— Vid. Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. viii. . . . Quum præsertim nonnulli ex his Encratitas, Apotacticos, Hydroparastatas, vel Sarcoforos nominari se velint, &c.

^e Cyprian. Epist. lxxiii. ad Cæcilium, tot. p. 276, seqq. edit. Fell. Amstelod.

^f Ibid. p. 153, (p. 280, edit. Fell.) Videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi. Quando autem in calice vino aqua miscetur, Christo populus adunatur, et credentium plebs sanguini ejus [or, ei], in quem credit, copulatur et conjungitur. Quæ copulatio et conjunctio aquæ et vini sic miscetur in calice Domini, ut commixtio illa non possit ab invicem separari. . . . Sic autem in sanctificando calice Domini offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest: nam si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis: si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo; quando autem utrumque miscetur, et adunatione confusa sibi invicem copulatur, tunc sacramentum spiritale et cœleste perficitur.

Council of Carthage^c seems to have had the same opinion of the necessity of water, when they determined, as we have heard before, that nothing should be offered at the altar but what the Lord himself commanded; that is, bread, and wine mingled with water. And St. Austin was a member of that council; and, therefore, may be supposed to have been of the same judgment. He also quotes the foresaid epistle of Cyprian with approbation.^b Gennadiusⁱ assigns two reasons for the use of mixing water with wine; first, because it is according to the example of Christ; and, secondly, because when our Saviour's side was pierced with the spear, there came forth water and blood. This latter reason is also assigned by St. Ambrose, or whoever wrote the book *De Sacramentis* under his name;^k and by Martin Bracaraensis,^l in his collection of Greek Canons. The author of the Epistle to the Egyptians, under the name of Pope

^c Conc. Carth. III. c. xxiv. Ut in sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini nihil amplius offeratur, quam ipse Dominus tradidit, hoc est, panis, et vinum aqua mixtum.

^b Aug. de Doctrin. Christ. lib. iv. c. xxi. (vol. iii. p. 63.) Beatus Cyprianus submisso dicendi genere utitur in eo libro, ubi de sacramento calicis disputat. Solvitur ibi quippe quæstio, in qua quæritur, utrum calix Dominicus aquam solam, an eam vino mixtam, debeat habere.

ⁱ Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. lxxv. In eucharistia non debet pura aqua offerri, ut quidam sobrietatis falluntur imagine, sed vinum aqua mixtum: quia et vinum fuit in redemptionis nostro mysterio, cum dixit, 'Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis,' et aqua mixtum, quod post cœnam dabatur; sed et de latere ejus, lancea perfosso, aqua cum sanguine egressa,' &c.

^k Ambros. de Sacram. lib. v. c. l. Tetigit petram, et petra undam maximam fudit, sicut apostolus ait, 'Bibebant autem de consequenti eos petra: petra autem erat Christus.' Non immobilis petra, quæ populum sequebatur. Et tu bibe, ut te Christus sequatur. . . . Tangit sacerdos calicem, redundat aqua in calice, salit in vitam æternam, et bibit populus Dei, quæ Dei gratiam consequutus est. Didicisti ergo hoc. Accipe et aliud. In tempore Dominicæ passionis, quum Sabbatum magnum instaret, quia vivebat Dominus noster Jesus Christus vel latrones, miseri sunt qui percuterent eos: venientes autem invenerunt defunctum Dominum Jesum Christum; tunc unus de militibus lancea latus ejus tetigit, et de latere ejus aqua fluxit et sanguis. Quare aqua? quare sanguis? Aqua, ut emundaret: sanguis, ut redimeret, &c. (Paris. iv. 132.)

^l Martin. Bracar. Collect. Canon. c. lv. (apud Justell. in App. tom. i. Bibl. Juris Canon. fol. xxvi.) Non oportet aliquid aliud in sanctuario offerri, præter panem, et vinum et aquam, quæ in typo Christo benedicuntur: quia, dum in cruce penderet, de corpore ejus sanguis effluxit et aqua.

Julius,^m insists upon Cyprian's reason, "That it is to shew the union of Christ with his people." And the third Council of Braga relates Cyprian's words, correcting several other abuses that were crept into the administration of this sacrament;ⁿ as of some who offered milk instead of wine; and others, who only dipped the bread into the wine, and so denied the people their complement of the sacrament; and others, who used no other wine but what they pressed out of the clusters of grapes that were then presented at the Lord's table; all which they condemn, and order that nothing but bread, and wine mingled with water, should be offered, according to the determination of the ancient councils. The Council of Auxerre notes some others who offer mead, or honey and water mixed together;^o who are also condemned, as going against the common rule of offering nothing but wine and water in the sacrifice of the altar. The author of the Commentaries upon St. Mark, under the name of St. Jerom,^p gives another reason for mixing water with wine, "That, by the one, we might be purged from sin; and, by the other, redeemed from punishment." These reasons, indeed, are noways demonstrative: however, that the practice was both ancient and general, is evident from Justin Martyr^q

^m Julii Ep. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. Distinct. ii. c. vii. Si necesse sit, botrus in calice comprimatur et aqua misceatur: quia calix Dominicus, juxta canonum præcepta, vino et aqua permistus debet offerri; quia videmus in aqua populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi, &c.

ⁿ Conc. Bracar. III. (al. IV.) c. ii. Audivimus quosdam schismatica ambitione detentos, lac pro vino in Divinis sacrificiis dedicare; alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere; quosdam etiam [non] expressum vinum in sacramento Dominici calicis offerre. . . . Ideo nulli deinceps licitum erit, aliud in sacrificiis Divinis offerre, nisi juxta antiquorum sententias conciliorum, panem tantum et calicem vino et aqua permixtum. (vi. 562.)

^o Conc. Antissiodor. c. viii. Non licet in altario in sacrificio Divino mellitum, quod mulsum appellatur, nec ullum aliud poculum, extra vinum cum aqua mixtum, offerre.

^p Hieron. in Marc. c. xiv. Accepit Jesus panem . . . : formans sanguinem suum in calicem vino et aqua mixtum, ut alio purgemur a culpis, alio redimamur a poenis.

^q Justin. Apol. p. 97, ε. Εὐχαριστήσαντες τοῦ προειστώτος, καὶ ἱπυφνηθήσαντες παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδασιν ἑκάστη τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαρισθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἶνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφίρουσι.

and Irenæus,¹ who mentions it as the custom of the Church, without assigning any further reason for it. And so, likewise, Gregory Nyssen² and Theodoret,³ with some others, produced by Vossius in his dissertation upon this subject.⁴ The Armenians are said to have consecrated only in wine: but that is reckoned an error in them by Theophylact;⁵ and they are equally condemned with the *Hydroparastatæ*, or Aquarians, by the Council of Trullo,⁶ which produces the authority of St. James and St. Basil's Liturgy against them. To which may be added, the liturgies under the name of St. Mark, and St. Chrysostom, and the Constitutions.⁷ Yet, after all, as there is no express command for this in the

¹ Iren. lib. v. c. ii. 'Ὅστις οὖν καὶ τὸ κικραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγενῆς ἄρτος ἐπιδίδχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

² Nyssen. Orat. Catech. c. xxxvii. 'Ἐστὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ βρώσει ἄρτος, ἐν δὲ τῇ πόσει τὸ ὕδωρ ἱφιδυσμένον τῇ οἴνῳ, κ. τ. λ. — (Not. Sermonis cohærentia legenda est, si de horum verborum sensu recte velis judicare.—Grischov.)

³ Theodoret. Dialog. i. tom. iv. p. 17. 'Ἐν δὲ γι τῇ τῶν μυστηρίων παραδόσει, ὅμα τὸ ἄρτον ἐκάλει, καὶ αἷμα τὸ κρῶμα.

⁴ Voss. Thes. Theol. p. 494, (p. 308, edit. Hag. Com. 1658.) Quam mos sit vetus aquam vino miscendi, docere nos potest Justinus Martyr. Apol. ii. ubi in cænæ descriptione meminit aperte τοῦ εὐχαρισθέντος ἄρτου, καὶ οἴνου, καὶ ὕδατος.—Atque ab eadem causa est, quod Irenæus (lib. iv. c. lvii.) vocat 'temperamentum calicis:' quod item (lib. v. c. ii.) scribat, 'Quando mistus calix et fractus panis percipit verbum Dei, fit eucharistia sanguinis et corporis Christi.' Etiam fuse de hoc Cyprianus, Ep. lxxiii. ex qua superius quædam adduximus. Hic adde Julium, urbis episcopum, apud Gratianum, Basilium in Liturgia, Gregorium Nyssenum, Orat. Catech. c. xxxvii.—Ambrosium, lib. v. de Sacram. c. i.—Chrysostom. in Liturgia, incertum sub Hieronymi nomine in Marcum, c. xiv. 18.—Aug. lib. iv. de Doctrin. Christ. c. xxi.—Proclum, de Traditione Divinæ Liturgiæ.—Theodoret. Dialog. i.—Cæsarium'Arelatensem sive Eucherium, serm. v. in Pascha.—Martin. Bracarensem, in Collect. Can. Orientalium, c. iv.—Bedam, in Luc. lib. vi. c. xxii.—Damascenum, lib. iv. c. xiv.—Rabanum Maurum, de Institut. Cler. lib. i. c. xxxiii.—Paschasium de Sacram. Euchar. c. xi.—Micrologum, Eccles. Observat. c. x.—Algerum, de eodem, lib. ii. c. iv.—Nicephorum Callistum, lib. xvii. c. liii. ut Lombardum mittam et scholasticos, qui ad eum scripserunt.

⁵ Theophyl. Comment. in Joan. xix. Αἰσχυρίσθωσαν Ἀρμένιοι, οἱ μὴ παρακινοῦντες ὕδωρ τῇ οἴνῳ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις.

⁶ Conc. Trul. c. xxxii. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἰάκωβος, ὁ κατὰ σάρκα Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἀδελφός, ὃς τῆς Ἱερουσολυμῶν ἐκκλησίας πρῶτος τὸν θρόνον ἐπιστεῦθη καὶ βασιλεὺς ὁ τῆς Καισαρίων ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, οὗ τὸ κλίον κατὰ πάσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην διδραμεν, ἰγγράφως τὴν μυστικὴν ἡμῖν ἱερωγίαν παραδιδώκοις, οὕτω τελιοῦν ἐν τῇ δεῖα λειτουργίᾳ ἐξ ὕδατος τε καὶ οἴνου τὸ ἱερὸν ποτήριον ἐκδιδῶκας.

⁷ Constitut. lib. viii. c. xii. vol. i. p. 402, fin. edit. Cotelier. 'Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κίρσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ ἀγιάσας, ἐπίδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λίγων, Πίσις ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. (i. 479, E.)

institution, notwithstanding this general consent of the ancient Church, it is commonly determined by modern divines, as well of the Roman as Protestant communion, that it is not essential to the sacrament itself: as the reader that is curious may find demonstrated in Vossius* in his dissertation upon this subject.

SECT. VIII. — *Of some Heretics, who made Alterations or Additions to the Elements in the Eucharist.*

As to the ancients, they are not to be blamed in keeping strictly to this custom, because they thought it a part of the institution; upon which account, they censured all that made any alteration in the elements, either by addition, or subtraction, or changing one element for another. The Aquarians, as we have heard, were condemned for taking away the wine; the Armenians, and others, for not using water also; others were condemned for changing the wine into milk or honey, mixed with water; others substituted grapes instead of wine; others pulse instead of bread: of all which, because we have spoken before, in the two foregoing sections, I need say no more in this place. But, beside these, there was once a senseless sect, which thought they did not celebrate the eucharist in perfection, unless they offered cheese together with the bread; whence they had the name of *Artotyritæ*, from *ἄρτος*, which in Greek signifies ‘bread,’ and *τυρός*, ‘cheese.’ This is the account which Epiphanius^b gives of them, and after him St. Austin, saying,^c “The Artotyrites are so called from their oblation, for they offer bread and cheese, saying, ‘That the first oblations that were offered by men, in the infancy of the world, were of the fruits of the earth, and of sheep.’”

* Voss. Thes. Theol. ibid. Disput. Quarta, p. 302, seqq.

^b Epiphan. Hæres. xlix. n. ii. Ἀρτοτυρίτας δὲ αὐτοὺς καλεῖσθαι, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν μυστηρίοις ἐπιστείνεσθαι ἄρτον καὶ τυρόν, καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖν τὰ αὐτῶν μυστήρια.

^c Aug. de Hæres. c. xlviil. Artotyritæ sunt quibus oblatio eorum hoc nomen dedit: offerunt enim panem et caseum, dicentes, a primis hominibus oblationes de fructibus terræ et ovium fuisse celebratas.

SECT. IX.—*And of others who rejected the Use of the Sacrament altogether.*

There were others, who wholly rejected the use of all external symbols or sacraments in general, and, consequently, both baptism and the eucharist, upon a pretence that faith, and knowledge, and spiritual worship, were the only things that were required of Christians. Upon this pretence, the *Ascodru-tæ* (or *-pitæ*), who were a sort of Gnostics, neither administered baptism nor the eucharist in their society. They said, the Divine mysteries were incorporeal and invisible things; and, therefore, not to be represented by such corporeal and visible things as water, or bread and wine; but perfect knowledge was their redemption. So Theodoret^d describes them; and so both he and Epiphanius^e describe another abominable sect, who, from one of their principal tenets, were called Archontics. They taught, that the world was not made by the supreme God, but by certain inferior powers, seven or eight in number, whom they called *Archontes*, ‘rulers’ of the several orbs of the heavens, one above another, to the chief of which they gave the name of ‘Sabaoth;’ and they pretended, that baptism and the eucharist were only institutions of this Sabaoth, the god of the Jews, and giver of the law, and not the ordinances of the supreme God: for which reason they wholly rejected the use of them. Some other such sects there were among the ancient heresies, who despised the eucharist^f upon the like pretences; but these are sufficient to shew us what sort of men they were that anciently contemned this holy ordinance: and, therefore, without further digressing to make any nicer inquiry after them, I now return to the business and service of the Church.

^d Theodoret. de Fabulis Hæretic. lib. i. c. x. Οὗτοι δὲ φασί, μὴ χρῆναι τὰ θεία μυστήρια, ἀοράτων ὄντα σύμβολα, δι’ ὁρμίων ἱστιλιῖσθαι πραγμάτων, καὶ τὰ ἄσώματα δι’ αἰσθητῶν καὶ σωματικῶν. εἶναι δὲ τὴν τιλείαν ἀπολύτρωσιν τὴν ἀληθῆ τοῦ ὄντος ἐπίγνωσιν. . . . διὰ τοῦτο, οὐτε βαπτίζουσι τοὺς προσιόντας, οὐδὲ ἱστιλιῦται παρ’ αὐτοῖς τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὸ μυστήριον· λύτρωσιν γὰρ καλοῦσι, τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἐπίγνωσιν. (Hal. 1772, iv. p. 302.)

^e Ibid. c. xi. tot. — Epiphan. Hæres. xi. n. ii. tot.

^f Vid. Origen. περὶ εὐχῆς, n. xiii. Ea penitus auferentes, quæ sensibus percipiuntur, nec baptismum nec eucharistiam usurpantes, &c.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE OBLATION AND CONSECRATION-PRAYERS.

SECT. I. — *The Form of Thanksgiving and Consecration-Prayers described out of the Constitutions.*

As soon as the people's offerings were made, and bread and wine were set apart for the eucharist, they proceeded to the solemn consecration of them; the manner of which is described at large in the Constitutions, which I will first set down here, and then compare the several parts of it with the authentic accounts we have in other ancient writers. Immediately, then, after the first prayers for the faithful are ended, the deacon is ordered^a to give a solemn admonition, saying, *Πρόσχωμεν*, 'Let us give attention.' "Then the bishop or priest salutes the Church, saying, 'The peace of God be with you all;' and the people answer, 'And with thy spirit.' After this the deacon says to them all, 'Salute ye one another with a holy kiss.' Then the clergy salute the bishop; and laymen, their fellow laymen; and the women, the women; the children standing before the *bema*, that is, either 'the reading-desk' or 'the altar,' with a deacon attending them, to see that they keep good order; others of the deacons walking about the church, and inspecting the men and women, that there be no tumult, nor making of signs to one another, nor whispering, nor sleeping; and others standing at the men's gate, and the sub-deacons at

^a Constitut. lib. viii. c. xi. (vol. i. p. 472, D.) Μιτὰ τοῦτο λήγῃν ὁ διάκονος, *Πρόσχωμεν* καὶ ἀσπαζίσθω ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ λήγῃτω, Ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ μιτὰ πάντων ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἀποκρινάσθω, Καὶ μιτὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σου καὶ ὁ διάκονος ἐπάτω πάντιν, Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἀγίῳ καὶ ἀσπαζίσθωσαν οἱ τοῦ κλήρου τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, οἱ λαϊκοὶ ἄνδρες τοὺς λαϊκοὺς, αἱ γυναῖκες τὰς γυναῖκας· τὰ παῖδια δὲ σηκίτωσαν πρὸς τῷ βήματι καὶ διάκονος αὐτοῖς ἵτιρος ἴστω ἰφιστῶς, ὅπως μὴ ἀτακτῶσι καὶ ἄλλοι διάκονοι περιπατιέτωσαν, καὶ σκοπιέτωσαν τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας, ὅπως μὴ θύρῳδες τις γίνηται, καὶ μὴ τις νύσση, ἢ ψιθυρίσῃ, ἢ νυστάξῃ· οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ἰστάσθωσαν εἰς τὰς τῶν ἀνδρῶν θύρας, καὶ οἱ ὑποδιάκονοι εἰς τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν ὅπως μὴ τις ἐξέλθῃ, μήτε ἀνοιχθῇ ἡ θύρα, πᾶν πιστός τις ἦ, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀναφορᾶς· εἰς δὲ ὑποδιάκονος διδόντω ἀπόνιψιν χερῶν τοῖς ἱερῶσι, σύμβολον καθαρότητος ψυχῶν Θεῷ ἀνακειμένων.

the women's gate, that the doors be not opened for any to go in or out in the time of oblation. After this, the sub-deacon brings water to the priests to wash their hands, as a sign of the purity of those souls that are consecrated unto God." "Immediately after this a deacon cries out,^b 'Let none of the catechumens be present, none of the hearers, none of the unbelievers, none of the heterodox party. Ye that have made the first prayer 'go forth,' Προέλθετε (or rather, as Cotelierius thinks it ought to be read, Προσέλθετε, 'Ye that have made the first prayers draw near,' for this seems to be spoken to the communicants as an invitation). Ye mothers, take your children, and bring them with you; let no one come with enmity against another; no one in hypocrisy. Let us stand upright before the Lord, with fear and trembling, to offer our sacrifice.' This said, the deacons bring the τὰ δῶρα, 'the elements,' to the bishop, at the altar; the presbyters standing on each hand of him, and two deacons, with their fans, to drive away the little insects, that none of them fall into the cup. Then the bishop, standing at the altar with the presbyters, makes a private prayer by himself, having on his white, or bright vestment, and signing himself with the sign of the cross in his forehead. Which done, he says, 'The grace of Almighty God, and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.' And the people answer with one voice, 'And with thy spirit.' Then the bishop says, 'Lift up

^b Constitut. lib. viii. c. xii. Φημι δὲ πάλιν Ἰάκωβος . . . ὅτι εὐθύς ὁ διάκονος λέγει· Μὴ τις τῶν κατηχομένων· μὴ τις ἀπροσμίμων· μὴ τις τῶν ἀπίστων· μὴ τις τῶν ἐτιροδύξαν· οἱ τὴν πρώτην εὐχὴν εὐχόμενοι προέλθῃσι· τὰ παιδία προσλαμβάνοντες αἱ μητέρες· μὴ τις κατὰ τινας· μὴ τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει· ὁρθοὶ πρὸς Κύριον μιστὰ φόβου καὶ τρέμου ἱστῶντες ὅμην προσφίρειν. ὃν γινόμενων οἱ διάκονοι προσαγίτῳσαν τὰ δῶρα τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον· καὶ οἱ περισυτέροι ἐκ δίσκων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξ εὐανύμων στήκνιτῳσαν, ὡς ἂν μαθεταὶ παριστῶντες διδασκᾶν· δύο δὲ διάκονοι ἐξ ἱκατέρων τῶν μιστῶν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κατεγίτῳσαν ἐξ ὑμίνων λιπατῶν ῥιπίδιον, ἢ πτερῶν ταῦνος, ἢ ὀβύης· καὶ ἥριμα ἀποσποδίζοντες τὰ μικρὰ τῶν ἱσταμένων ζώων, ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἐγχερίμπτωνται εἰς τὰ κύπελλα· εὐχόμενος οὖν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἄμα τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, καὶ λαμπρὰν ἰσθήτα μετινδύς, καὶ στὰς πρὸς τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, τὸ τρέπαιον τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μιστόπου τῇ χειρὶ ποιησάμενος εἰς πάντας, εἰπάτω, Ἡ χάρις τοῦ παντοκράτορος Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἔστω μιστὰ πάντων ὑμῶν· καὶ πάντες συμφώνως λεγόντων, Ὅτι καὶ μιστὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σου καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, Ἄνω τὸν νοῦν· καὶ πάντες, Ἐρχομιν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον· καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, Εὐχαριστήσωμιν τῷ Κυρίῳ· καὶ

your hearts.' And they all answer, ' We lift them up unto the Lord.' The bishop says again, ' Let us give thanks to the Lord.' And the people answer, ' It is meet and right so to do.' Then the bishop says, ' It is very meet and right, above all things, to praise thee, the true God, who art before all creatures; of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named; who art the only unbegotten, without original, without king, without lord; who hast need of nothing; who art the author of all good; who art above all cause and generation, and always the same; of whom all things have their original and existence. For thou art original knowledge, eternal sight, hearing without beginning, and wisdom without teaching; the first in nature, and the law of existing, exceeding all number. Who madest all things to exist out of nothing by thy only-begotten Son, whom thou didst beget, before all ages, by thy will, and power, and goodness, without the intervention of any; who is thy only-begotten Son, the Word that is God, the living Wisdom, the First-born of every creature, the Angel of thy great council, thy High-Priest, but the King and Lord of all the creatures, both visible and invisible; who is before all things, and by whom all things consist. For thou, O eternal God, didst create all things by him, and by him thou dost vouchsafe to rule and govern them in the orderly ways of thy providence; by whom thou didst give them being, by him, also, thou didst give them a well-being. O God, and Father

πάντες, Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον καὶ ἐ ἀρχιεὺς εἰπάτω, Ἄξιον ὡς ἀληθῆς καὶ δίκαιον, πρὸ πάντων ἀνυμνῶν σι τὸν ὄντως ὄντα Θεὸν, τὸν πρὸ τῶν γιννητῶν ὄντα· ἔξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται· τὸν μόνον ἀγίνητον, καὶ ἄναρχον, καὶ ἄσαρκον, καὶ ἀδόλοπον, τὸν ἀνιδιῶν, τὸν παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ χρηγόν, τὸν πάσης αἰτίας καὶ γίνεως κρείττονα, τὸν πάντοτε κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα· ἔξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καθάπερ ἐκ τινος ἀφιστηρίας, εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρεῖλθιν· σὺ γὰρ εἴ ἡ ἄναρχος γνῶσις, ἡ ἀίδιος ἔρασις, καὶ ἀγίνητος ἀκοή, ἡ ἀδίδακτος σοφία· ὁ πρῶτος τῇ φύσει, καὶ νόμος τῇ ἰσχύϊ, καὶ κρείττων παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ· τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγὼν διὰ τοῦ μονογινούς σου Υἱοῦ· αὐτὸν δὲ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων γιγνήσας βουλῇ σου, καὶ δυνάμει καὶ ἀγαθότητι, ἐμμεσιτυίας· Τίδ' ὁ μονογενὴς, Λόγον Θεοῦ, Σοφίαν ᾤσας, Πρωτότακον πάσης κτίσεως, Ἀγγέλων τῆς μεγάλης βουλῆς σου· Ἀρχιερίαν σὸν, Βασιλίαν δὲ καὶ Κύριον πάσης νοητῆς καὶ αἰσθητῆς φύσεως· τὸν πρὸ πάντων, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα· σὺ γὰρ, Θεὶ αἰώνι, δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα πιστοίηκας, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τῆς προσκευῆς προνοίας τὰ ἔλα ἄξιοις· δι' οὗ γὰρ τὸ εἶναι ἐχάρισμα, δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ εἶναι ἰδωρῶν· ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ μονογινούς Υἱοῦ σου· ὁ δὲ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων ποιήσας τὰ Χερουσίμ καὶ τὰ Σεραφίμ, αἰῶνας τι καὶ στρατιάς,

of thy only-begotten Son ; who by him didst create the cherubims and seraphims, the ages and hosts, the dominions and powers, the principalities and thrones, the archangels and angels ; and after them didst by him create this visible world, and all things that are therein. For thou art he that hast established the heavens as an arch, and extended them like a curtain ; that hast founded the earth upon nothing by thy sole will ; that hast fixed the firmament, and formed night and day ; that hast brought the light out of thy treasures, and superadded darkness for a covering, to give rest to the creatures that move in the world ; that hast set the sun in the heaven to govern the day, and the moon to govern the night, and ordered the course of the stars, to the praise of thy magnificent power ; that hast made the water for drink and purgation, and the vital air both for breathing and speaking ; that hast made the fire to be a comfort in darkness, to supply our wants, and that we should be both warmed and enlightened thereby ; that hast divided the great sea from the earth, and made the one navigable, and the other passable on foot ; that hast filled the one with small and great animals, and the other with tame and wild beasts ; that hast crowned the earth with plants and herbs of all sorts, and adorned it with flowers, and enriched it with seeds ; that hast established the deep, and set a great barrier about it, walling the great heaps of salt water, and bounding them with gates of the smallest sand ; that some-

δυνάμεις τε καὶ ἰξουσίας, ἀρχάς τε καὶ θρόνους, ἀρχαγγέλους τε καὶ ἀγγέλους· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα, ποιήσας δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν φαινόμενον τοῦτον κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ· σὺ γὰρ εἰς ὃ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὡς καμάραν στήσας, καὶ ὡς διήβρι· ἱκετίας, καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκ' οὐδενὸς ἰδρύσας γνώμῃ μόνῃ· ὃ πῆξας στιβεῖωμα, καὶ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν κατασκευάσας· ὃ ἐξαγαγὼν φῶς ἐκ θησαυρῶν, καὶ τῇ τούτου στολῇ ἱεραγαγὼν τὸ σκότος, εἰς ἀνάσπουλιν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ κινουμένων ζώων· ὃ τὸν ἥλιον τάξας εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ τὴν σελήνην εἰς ἀρχὰς τῆς νυκτός, καὶ τὸν χροὸν τῶν ἀστέρων ἐν οὐρανῷ καταγράφας, εἰς αἶνον τῆς σῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας· ὃ ποιήσας ὕδωρ πρὸς πόσιν καὶ κάθαρσιν, αἶρα ζωτικὴν πρὸς εἰσπνοὴν καὶ φωνῆς ἀπόδοσιν διὰ γλώττης πληττούσης τὸν αἶρα, καὶ ἀκοὴν συνεργομένην ὅπ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἱκαίην εἰσδιχομένην τὴν προσπίπτουσαν αὐτῇ λαλίαν· ὃ ποιήσας πῦρ πρὸς σκότους παραμυθίαν, πρὸς ἰνδίας ἀναπλήρωσιν, καὶ τὸ θιερμαίνεσθαι ἡμᾶς καὶ φωτίζεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· ὃ τὴν μεγάλην θάλασσαν χαρίσας τῆς γῆς, καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀναδιίξας πλωτῇ, τὴν δὲ πρὸς βάσειμον ποιήσας, καὶ τὴν μὲν ζώους μικροῖς καὶ μεγάλοις πληθύνας, τὴν δὲ ἡμίραις καὶ ἀνιδάσοις πληρώσας· φυτοῖς τε διαφοροῖς στίψας, καὶ βοτάναις στιφανώσας, καὶ ἄνθις καλλύνας, καὶ σπέρμασι πλουτίσας· ὃ συστησάμενος ἄλυσσον, καὶ μίγα

times raisest the same deep to the magnitude of mountains by thy winds, and sometimes layest it plain like a field; now making it rage with a storm, and then again quieting it with a calm, that they which sail therein, may find a safe and gentle passage; that hast begirt the world, which thou createdst by Christ, with rivers, and watered it with brooks, and filled it with springs of living water, always flowing, and bound up the earth with mountains, to give it a firm and unmovable situation. Thou hast filled thy world, and adorned it with odoriferous and medicinal herbs, with a multitude and variety of animals, weaker and stronger, some for meat and some for labour, some of a mild and some of a fiercer nature; with the hissing of serpents and sweeter notes of birds of divers kinds; with the revolutions of years, and numbers of months and days, and orders of stated seasons; with flying clouds, producing rain, for the procreation of fruits, and preservation of animals; with winds to blow in order at thy command, and a multitude of plants and herbs. Neither hast thou only made the world, but created man in it, to be citizen of the world, and made him the ornament of thy beautiful structure. For thou saidst to thy own Wisdom, 'Let us make man in our own image and likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air;' and, therefore, thou madest him of an immortal soul, and a dissolvable body, creating the one out of nothing, and the other out of the four

κῆτος [al. κύτος] αὐτῇ περιβίς, ἄλμυρῶν ὑδάτων σισωριυμῖνα πιλάγη, περιφράζας δὲ αὐτὴν πύλαις ἄμμου λιπτοτάτης· ὁ πνεύμασί ποτε μὲν αὐτὴν κορυφῶν εἰς ὄριον μίγνυτο, ποτε δὲ στρωνῦν αὐτὴν εἰς πιδίον, καὶ ποτε μὲν ἱκαίνων χιμῶνι, ποτε δὲ πρᾶντων γαλήνῃ, ὥς ναυσιπόροις πλωτῆρσιν εὐκολοὶ εἴηαι πρὸς πορίαν· ὁ ποταμοῖς διαζώσας τὸν ὑπὸ σου διὰ Χριστοῦ γινόμενον κόσμον, καὶ χιμᾶρῃσι ἐπικλύσας, καὶ πηγαῖς ἀινάοις μυθώσας, ὅρσι δὲ περισφίγξας εἰς ἴδραν ἀτριμῇ γῆς ἀσφαλίστάτην· ἐπλήρυσας γὰρ σου τὸν κόσμον, καὶ διεκόσμησας αὐτὸν βοτάναις ὑόμοις καὶ ἰαίοις· ζώοις πολλοῖς καὶ διαφόροις, ἀλκίμοις καὶ ἀσθενιστίροις, ἰδιώμοις καὶ ἱεργοῖς, ἡμίροις καὶ ἀτιθάσοις· ἐρπετῶν συριμοῖς, πτηνῶν ποικίλων κλαγγαῖς· ἱνιαυτῶν κύκλοις, μηνῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν ἀριθμοῖς, τροπῶν τάξις· νιφῶν ὁμβροτόπων διαδρομαῖς, εἰς καρπῶν γονὰς, καὶ ζώων σύστασιν, σταθμὸν ἀνέμων διαπνέοντων, ὅτι προσταχθῶσι παρὰ σου, τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν βοτανῶν τὸ πλῆθος· καὶ οὐ μόνον τὸν κόσμον ἰδημιούργησας· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν κοσμοπολίτην ἄνθρωπον ἐν αὐτῷ ἰποίησας, κόσμου κόσμον αὐτὸν ἀναδιῶξας· εἶπας γὰρ τῇ σῇ σοφίᾳ· ποιήσωμιν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν, καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν· καὶ ἀρχίτωσαν τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ τῶν πετινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· διὸ καὶ πεποίηκας αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ σώματος σκιδαστοῦ·

elements; and gavest him, in his soul, a rational knowledge, a power to discern between piety and impiety, and a judgment to distinguish between good and evil; and, in his body, the privilege and faculty of five several senses, with the power of local motion. For thou, O God Almighty, didst by Christ plant paradise in Eden, towards the east, adorning it with all kinds of plants meet for food, and placing man therein, as in a well furnished house; and in his creation thou gavest a natural law, implanted in his mind, that thereby he might have, within himself, the seeds of Divine knowledge. And when thou hadst placed him in the paradise of delights and pleasure, thou gavest him power to eat of all things, only forbidding him to taste of one kind, in expectation of something better: that, if he observed that command, he might attain to immortality, as the reward of his obedience. But he, neglecting this command, and by the fraud of the serpent, and the counsel of the woman, tasting the forbidden fruit, thou didst justly drive him out of paradise; and yet, in goodness, didst not despise him, when he had destroyed himself, for he was thy workmanship; but thou, who didst put the creatures in subjection under him, didst appoint him to get his food by labour and sweat, thy providence concurring to produce, augment, and bring all things to maturity and perfection. Thou didst suffer him for awhile to sleep the sleep of death; and then, with an oath, calledst him again to a regeneration, dissolving the

τῆς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ ἐκ τῶν τισσάρων στοιχείων· καὶ δίδωκας αὐτῷ, κατὰ μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν, τὴν λογικὴν διάγνωσιν, εὐσεβείας καὶ ἀσεβείας διάκρισιν, δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου παρατήρησιν· κατὰ δὲ τὸ σῶμα τὴν πένταθλον ἰσχυρίαν αἰσθησιν, καὶ τὴν μεταβατικὴν κίνησιν· οὐ γὰρ, Θεὸς παντοκράτωρ, διὰ Χριστοῦ παραδίδουσιν ἐν Ἑὲμ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς ἰφύτισας, παντοίων φυτῶν ἰδιόμιμον κόσμον, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὡς εἰ ἐν ἱστοίᾳ πολυτελεῖ εἰσάγωγος αὐτόν· καὶ τῷ ποιῶν νόμον δίδωκας αὐτῷ ἔμμετρον, ὥπως οἰκοθὴν καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ ἔχοι τὰ στίγματα τῆς θειότητος· εἰσαγαγὼν δὲ εἰς τὸν τῆς τροφῆς παραδίδουσιν, πάντων μὲν ἀνηκας αὐτῷ τὴν ἰξουσίαν πρὸς μεταλήψιν, ἰσὺς δὲ μένου τὴν γίῃσιν ἀπείσας ἐπ' ἑλπίδι κραιπνότητος, ἵνα ἰὰν φυλάξῃ τὴν ἐντολὴν, μισθὸν ταύτης τὴν ἀθανασίαν κομίσῃται· ἀμελήσαντα δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς, καὶ γινούσμενοι ἀπηγορευμένου καρποῦ ἀπάτη ὄφεις, καὶ συμβουλία γυναικὸς, τοῦ μὲν παραδείσου δικαίως ἔχουσας αὐτόν, ἀγαθότητι δὲ εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἀπολλύμενοι οὐχ ὑπεριτίδεις· σὺν γὰρ ἦν δημιουργήματα· ἀλλὰ καθυποτάξας αὐτῷ τὴν κτίσιν, δίδωκας αὐτῷ οἰκίους ἰδεῶσι καὶ πόνοις περιζῆν ἑαυτῷ τὴν τροφήν, σοῦ πάντα φύοντος καὶ αὐξάντος καὶ πασχαίνοντος· χρόνῳ δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγον αὐτὸν κοιμήσας, ὅρα καὶ εἰς παλιγγενεσίαν ἰγκάλισας· ἔρως θανάτου λύσας, ζῶν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως ἐπηγγίλῳ· καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον· ἀλλὰ καὶ

bands of death, and promising him life by a resurrection. And not only so, but giving him an innumerable posterity, thou didst glorify such of them as adhered to thee, and punishedst those that apostatized from thee: receiving the sacrifice of Abel as a holy man, and rejecting the offering of Cain as abominable, for murdering his brother. Thou didst also receive Seth and Enos, and translate Enoch; for thou art the Creator of men, and the Author of life, and the Supplier of all their wants, their Lawgiver that rewardest those that keep thy laws, and punishest those that transgress them. Thou didst bring a universal deluge upon the world, because of the multitude of the ungodly, but deliveredst righteous Noah out of the flood with eight souls in thy ark, making him the end of the preceding generation, and the father of those that were to come. Thou didst kindle a dreadful fire against the five cities of the Sodomites, and turn a fruitful land into a vale of salt, for the wickedness of them that dwelt therein, but didst deliver righteous Lot from the burning. Thou art he that didst deliver Abraham from the impiety of his ancestors, and madest him to become heir of the world, and didst manifest thy Christ unto him. Thou didst appoint Melchisedech to be the high-priest of thy service. Thou didst declare thy servant Job, after many sufferings, to be conqueror of the serpent, that first author of evil. Thou madest Isaac to be the son of promise. Thou madest Jacob to be the father of twelve children, and his

τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἰς πλῆθος ἀνέριθμον χίρας, τοὺς ἰμμείναντάς σοι ἰδύσας· τοὺς δὲ ἀποστάντας σου ἰκόσας· καὶ τοῦ μὲν Ἀβὶλ, ὡς ὁσίου, προσδιέξαμνος τὴν θυσίαν, τοῦ δὲ ἀδελφοκτόνου Καὶν ἀποστραφεῖς τὸ δῶρον, ὡς ἰναγοῦς· καὶ πρὸς τούτοις τὸν Σὴθ, καὶ τὸν Ἐνὸς προσελάβου, καὶ τὸν Ἐνὼχ μετατίθεικας· σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῆς ζωῆς χορηγός, καὶ τῆς ἰνδείας πληρωτής· καὶ τῶν νόμων δοτὴρ, καὶ τῶν φυλακτόντων αὐτοὺς μισθαποδότης, καὶ τῶν παρακαινόντων αὐτοὺς ἱδικός· ὁ τὸν μέγαν κατακλυσμὸν ἰπαγαγὼν τῷ κόσμῳ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀσεβησάντων, καὶ τὸν δίκαιον Νῶε ῥυσάμενος ἐκ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἐν λάρνακι σὺν ἑκτῷ ψυχαῖς, τίλος μὲν τῶν παρηχηκότων, ἀρχὴν δὲ τῶν μιλλόντων ἱαγρίνισθαι· ὁ τὸ φοβερὸν σῶν κατατῆς Σοδωμνῆς πινταπόλειος ἐξάψας, καὶ γῆν καρποφόρον εἰς ἄλμην θίμενος ἀπὸ κακίας τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν αὐτῇ· καὶ τὸν ὅσιον Λὼτ ἐξαρπάσας τοῦ ἱμπερησμοῦ· σὺ εἶ ὁ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ ῥυσάμενος προγονικῆς ἀσεβείας, καὶ κληρονόμον τοῦ κόσμου καταστήσας, καὶ ἱμφανίσας αὐτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν σου· ὁ τὸν Μελχισεδεκ, ἀρχιερεὶα τῆς λατρείας προχειρισάμενος· ὁ τὸν πολύτλαν θιράποντά σου Ἰὼβ νικητὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἔφωος ἀναδείξας· ὁ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ ἱπαγγελίας υἱὸν ποιησάμενος· ὁ τὸν Ἰακώβ πατέρα δώδεκα παιδων, καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ εἰς πλῆθος χίρας, καὶ ἱσαγαγὼν εἰς Αἴγυπτον

offspring to be innumerable, and broughtest threescore and fifteen souls into Egypt. Thou, Lord, didst not despise Joseph, but for his chastity madest him to rule over the Egyptians. Thou, Lord, didst not forget the Hebrews, when the Egyptians oppressed them, because of the promise made to their fathers; but didst punish the Egyptians, and deliver thy people. And when men had corrupted the law of nature, written in their minds, and some began to think the creatures had their existence of themselves, and honoured them above what was meet, placing them in the same rank with thee, the God of all, thou didst not suffer them to wander in error, but, raising up thy holy servant Moses, thou didst by him promulge a written law, to revive and support the law of nature, shewing the creatures to be the work of thy hands, and thereby expelling the error of polytheism out of religion. Thou didst honour Aaron, and his posterity, with the dignity of the priesthood. Thou didst chastise the Hebrews when they sinned, and receive them into favour when they turned unto thee. Thou didst punish the Egyptians with ten plagues; and, dividing the sea, madest the Israelites to pass through it, drowning the Egyptians that pursued them. Thou madest the bitter water sweet with wood; thou broughtest streams out of the rock, when thou hadst divided the top of it; thou didst rain down manna out of heaven, and give them food out of the air, a measure of quails for every day; setting up a pillar of fire

ἐν ἰσομήκοντα πίντι ψυχαῖς· σὺ, Κύριε, 'Ιωσήφ οὐχ ὑπεριΐδες· ἀλλὰ μισθὸν τῆς διὰ σὺ σωφροσύνης ἰδωκας αὐτῷ τὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἄρχειν· σὺ, Κύριε, 'Εβραίους ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων καταπονουμένους οὐ περιΐδες, διὰ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν ἰσαγγελίας· ἀλλ' ἰβρίσω, κολάσας Αἰγυπτίους· παραφθεράντων δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν φυσικὸν νόμον, καὶ τὴν κρίσιν, ποτὶ μὴν αὐτόματον νομισάντων, ποτὶ δὲ πλείον ἢ δι' τιμωσάντων, καὶ σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῶν πάντων συνταττόντων οὐκ εἴσας πλανᾶσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀναδίδας τὸν ἅγιόν σου Θεράποντα Μωϋσῆν, δι' αὐτοῦ πρὸς βοήθειαν τοῦ φυσικοῦ τὸν γραπτὸν νόμον δίδωκας, καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἰδίδας σὸν ἔργον εἶναι, τὴν δὲ πολυθεῖον πλάσῃ ἐξώρισας· τὸν 'Ααρὼν καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἱερατικῇ τιμῇ ἰδίδεσας· 'Εβραίους ἀμαρτίνοντας ἐκόλασας, πισιστρέφοντας ἰδίδω· τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους δικαπλήγῃ ἱτιμωρήσας· θάλασσαν διελὼν, 'Ισραηλίτας διειβόσας· Αἰγυπτίους ἐπιδιώξαντας ὑποβρυχίους ἀπώλισας· ζύλην περὶ ὕδωρ ἐγλύκαντας· ἐκ πίστεως ἀρετοίμου ὕδωρ ἀνίχνας· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ τὸ μέννα ὕσας, τροφὴν ἐξ αἵρος ὀρυγμότηραν· στύλον πυρὸς τὴν νύκτα πρὸς φωτισμόν, καὶ στύλον νιφίλης ἡμέραν πρὸς σκιασμόν θάλαπυς· τὸν 'Ἰησοῦν στρατηγὸν ἀναδίδας, ἰπτά 'Ἰθνη Χαναναίων δι' αὐτοῦ καθύλις, 'Ιορδάνην διήρῃσας, τοὺς ποταμούς· 'Ἠθάρ ἐξέρας, τεῖχη κατήρριψας· ἄνι μηχανημάτων καὶ χιμερὸς ἀνθρωπίνης· ὥστε ἀπάντων

to give them light by night, and the pillar of the cloud to shadow them from heat by day. Thou didst constitute Joshua the captain of thy armies, and by him destroy the seven nations of the Canaanites, dividing Jordan, and drying up the rivers of Ethan, and laying flat the walls (of Jericho) without any engines of war, or concurrence of human power. For all these things we glorify thee, O Lord Almighty. The innumerable armies of angels adore thee; the archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, dignities, powers, hosts, and ages; the cherubims, and seraphims also, with six wings, with two of which they cover their feet, and with two their faces, and two fly, saying, with thousand thousands of archangels, and ten thousand times ten thousand angels, all crying out, without rest and intermission: 'And let all the people say together with them, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: blessed art thou for ever. Amen.' And after this let the bishop say, 'For thou truly art holy, the most holy, the most high, far exalted above all things, for evermore. Holy also is thy only-begotten Son, our Lord and God, Jesus Christ; who ministering to thee, his God and Father, in all things, both in various works of creation and providence, did not despise lost mankind; but, after the law of nature, after the admonitions of the written law, after the reprehensions of the prophets, after the administrations and presidency of angels, when men had corrupted both the natural and written law,

σοι ἡ δόξα, δίσποτα παντοκράτωρ· σὺ προσκυνοῦσι ἀνέριβμοι στρατιαὶ ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων, κυριοτήτων, ἀρχῶν, ἰξουσιῶν, δυνάμεων, στρατιῶν αἰώνιων· τὰ Χερουβίμ, καὶ τὰ ἱεραπτέρυγα Σεραφίμ, ταῖς μὲν δυοὶ κατακαλύπτοντα τοὺς πόδας, ταῖς δὲ δυοὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς, ταῖς δὲ δυοὶ πιτόμινα, καὶ λίγοντα, ἅμα χιλίαις χιλιάσιν ἀρχαγγέλων, καὶ μυρίαις μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, ἀκαταπαύστως καὶ ἀσιγήτως βοῶσαι. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἅμα ἐπάτω, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Κύριος Σαβᾶθ, πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ· εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· Ἀμήν· καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἔξῃς λεγίτω, Ἄγιος γὰρ εἶ ὡς ἀληθῶς, καὶ πανάγιος, ὕψιστος, καὶ ὑπερβούμενος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἅγιος δὲ καὶ ὁ μονογενὴς σου Υἱὸς, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸς, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός· ὃς εἰς πάντα ὑπερηρσάμενός σοι τῷ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατρὶ, εἰς τι δημιουργίαν διάφορον, καὶ πρόνοιαν κατάλληλον, οὐ περιεῖδε τὸ γίνος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαλλύμενον, ἀλλὰ μετὰ φυσικὸν νόμον, μετὰ νομικὴν παραίτησιν, μετὰ προφητικὸν ἐλίγχους, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐπιστασίας, παραφθιρόντων σὺν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τὸν φυσικὸν νόμον, καὶ τῆς μνήμης ἐκβαλλόντων τὸν κατακλυσμόν, τὴν ἐκπύρωσιν, τὰς κατ' Αἰγυπτίῳ πληγὰς, τὰς κατὰ Παλαισθηῶν σφαγὰς, καὶ μελλόντων ἔσον οὐδίσαν ἀπόλλυσθαι πάντων, εὐδόκησεν αὐτὸς γνώμῃ σὴ ὁ δημιουργὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἄνθρωπος

and erased the memory of the flood, and the burning of Sodom, and the plagues of Egypt, and devastations and slaughters of Palestine, and were now all ready to perish; he, who was the Creator of man, chose by thy will to become man; the Lawgiver, to be under the law; the High-Priest, to be the sacrifice; the Shepherd, to be made a sheep: whereby he appeased thee, his God and Father, and reconciled the world, and delivered all men from the wrath that hanged over their heads, being born of a virgin and made flesh, God the Word, the beloved Son, the first-born of every creature, according to the prophecies which he himself predicted of himself; made of the seed of David and Abraham, and of the tribe of Judah. He who was the former of all things that are made, was formed himself in the virgin's womb; he who is without flesh, was made flesh; and he who was begotten *ἄχρονως*, 'before all time,' was born in time. He lived a holy life, and taught a holy doctrine; expelling all manner of sicknesses and infirmities from the bodies of men, and working signs and miracles among the people. He who feeds all that have need of food, and fills every living creature of his own good pleasure and bounty, did himself partake of meat, and drink, and sleep; he manifested thy name to them that knew it not; he put ignorance to flight, and revived true piety and godliness, fulfilled thy will, and finished the work which thou gavest him to do; and when all things were thus set in order and rectified by him, he

γινίσθαι, ὁ νομοθέτης ὑπὸ νόμους, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, ἱερεῖον· ὁ ποιμὴν, πόριζαν καὶ ἱξιμνίσαντό σε, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ κατὰ ἡλᾶς, καὶ τῆς ἐκτελεσμένης ὁρῆς τοὺς πάντας ἡλευθέρωσι, γινόμενος ἐκ παρθένου, γινόμενος ἐν σαρκὶ· ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς Υἱὸς, ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, κατὰ τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προφητείας προφητείας ἐκ πνεύματος Δαβὶδ, καὶ 'Αβραάμ, καὶ Φυλῆς 'Ισραὴλ καὶ γίγονεν ἐν μήτρᾳ παρθένου ὁ διαπλάσσειν πάντας τοὺς γινωσκόμενος, καὶ ἰσακρῶν ὁ ἄσκαρος, ὁ ἀχρόνως γιννηθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ γινίγνεται· πολυτιμώτατος ὅσιος καὶ παιδίσκας ἐνθίστους· πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπιδάσας, σημεία τε καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῷ λαῷ ποιήσας· τροφῆς καὶ ποτοῦ καὶ ὕπνου μεταλαβὼν, ὁ τρέφων πάντας τοὺς χεῖροντας τροφῆς, καὶ ἱμνιολῶν πᾶν ζῶον εὐδοκίας· ἱφανίζουσί σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν αὐτὸ, τὴν ἄνοιαν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, τὴν εὐδοκίαν ἀνιζωπύρην, τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν σου ἐπλήρωσι, τὸ ἔργον δ' ἰδοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπιτελείωσι· καὶ ταῦτα πάντα κατορθώσας, χερσὶν ἀνέμων κατασχέσεις, ἱερίων καὶ ἀρχιερέων ψευδονύμων καὶ λαῶν παρανόμων, προδοσίᾳ τοῦ τὴν κακίαν νοήσαντος, καὶ πολλὰ παθὼν ὑπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀτιμίαν ὑποστὰς τῇ συγχωρήσει, παραδοθὲς Πιλάτῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι, καὶ κριθὲς ὁ Κριτῆς, καὶ κατακριθεὶς ὁ Σωτὴρ, σταυρῷ προσηλώθῃ ὁ ἀπαθὴς, καὶ ἀπίαντι ὁ τῷ

was betrayed by the incurable malice of one of his own disciples, and apprehended by the hands of the wicked, priests and high-priests, falsely so called, together with a sinful people, of whom he suffered many things, and underwent all manner of indignities, by thy permission; he was delivered to Pilate, the governor: the Judge himself was judged; the Saviour of the world condemned; he who is impassible, was nailed to the cross; he who is immortal by nature, was made subject to death; and the Author of life, who quickens all things, was laid in the grave, that he might deliver those from suffering, for whose sake he came, and set them free from death, and break the bonds of the devil, and deliver men from his frauds and impostures; he rose again the third day from the dead, and conversed forty days with his disciples, and was taken up into heaven, and set at thy right hand, his God and Father.

“ ‘We, therefore, in commemoration of these things, which he suffered for us, give thanks to thee, Almighty God, not as thou deservest, and as is our duty, but *ὅσον δυνάμειθα*, ‘as far as we are able,’ so fulfilling his command. For in the same night that he was betrayed, he took bread in his holy and immaculate hands; and, looking up to thee his God and Father, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, ‘This is the mystery of the New Testament: take of it, and eat it; this is my body, which is broken for many for the remission of sins.’ Likewise he mixed a cup of wine and

φύσει ἀθάνατος, καὶ ἐτάφη ὁ ζωοποιὸς, ἵνα πάθους λύση καὶ θανάτου ἐξίληται τούτους, τοὺς δι’ οὓς παρεγίνετο, καὶ ῥήξῃ τὰ δισμὰ τοῦ διαβόλου, καὶ ῥύσῃται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τῆς ἀπάτης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνίστη ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ τισσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἰδιατερίψας τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἀνιλήθη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ ἐκαθίστη ἐκ δεξιῶν σου, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

Μνημονεύει οὖν ὃν δι’ ἡμᾶς ὑπάρχοντι, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Θεὲ παντοκράτορ, οὐχ ὅσον οφείλομεν, ἀλλ’ ὅσον δυνάμειθα, καὶ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ πληροῦμεν· ἡ γὰρ νυκτὶ παρεδίδου, λαβὼν ἄρτον ταῖς ἁγίαις καὶ ἀμώμοις αὐτοῦ χερσὶ, καὶ ἀναβλύψας εἰς τὸ, τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐσθῆν, Τοῦτο τὸ μυστήριον τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης· λαβῶντες ἑξ αὐτοῦ, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστί τὸ σώμα μου, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν θρυπτόμενον εἰς ἄφισιν ἁμαρτιῶν ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας ἑξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ ἁγιάσας ἐπίδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λίγων, Πίετε ἑξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφισιν ἁμαρτιῶν· αὐτοῦ ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἱερὴν ἀνάμνησιν ὅσας γὰρ ἰὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ πίνετε τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἱερὸν καταργεῖσθε, ἄχρις ἃν ἔλθῃ μνημονεῖναι τοῖνυ τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς

water, and, sanctifying it, he gave it unto them, saying, 'Drink ye all of this: for this is my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. This do in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth my death till I come.' We, therefore, being mindful of his passion, and death, and resurrection from the dead, and his return into heaven, and also of his second coming, when he shall return, with glory and power, to judge the quick and dead, and to render to every man according to his works, do offer unto thee, our King and God, this bread and this cup, according to his appointment, giving thanks to thee by him, for that thou dost vouchsafe to let us stand before thee, and minister unto thee; and we beseech thee to look propitiously upon these gifts here set before thee, our God, who hast need of nothing, and to accept them favourably, to the honour of thy Christ, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, who is the witness of the suffering of our Lord Jesus, that it may make this bread the body of thy Christ, and this cup the blood of thy Christ; that they who partake of it, may be confirmed in godliness, and obtain remission of sins; may be delivered from the devil and his impostures; may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and be made worthy of Christ, and obtain eternal life, thou being reconciled to them, O Lord Almighty.

“We beseech thee, further, O Lord, for thy holy Church, from one end of the earth to the other, which thou hast pur-

ίπανόδου, καὶ τῆς μιλλούσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας, ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμει, κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἰκαστῇ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, προσφίεσθαι σοι τῷ Βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν, τὸν ἄρτον τούτου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τούτου, ὑψαριστοῦντες σοι δι' αὐτοῦ, ἵφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἰσθάναι ἰσχύον σου, καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι καὶ ἀξιουμέναι σε, ὅπως ἐμὲν ὡς ἐκτελέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ προειρημένα ὄντα ταῦτα ἰσχύον σου, οὐ ὁ ἀνιδίης Θεός, καὶ ὑδοκήσῃς ἰπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ κατατίμῃς τὸ ἅγιόν σου Πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, τὴν μαρτύριαν τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ἀποφῇ τὸν ἄρτον τούτου σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τούτου αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες αὐτοῦ βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς ἐκτίθειν, ἀφίστοις ἀμαρτημάτων τύχῃς, τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς πλάνης αὐτοῦ ῥυθῶσι, Πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρωθῶσιν, ἅξιοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου γίνωνται, ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχῃς, σου καταλλαγίνοντες αὐτοῖς, Δίσποτα παντόκρατορ.

Ἔστι δι' ἐμὲ σου, Κύριε, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας σου ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀπὸ πειράτων ὡς πειρασῶν, ἣν περιποιήσῃς τῇ τιμῇ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, ὅπως αὐτὴν διαφυλάξῃς ἀμειστον καὶ ἀκλυδώνιστον, ἄχρη τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ὑπὲρ πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας σου ἐκκλησίας τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας ἵτι παρακαλοῦμέναι σε καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμῶν τοῦ

chased with the precious blood of thy Christ, that thou wouldst be pleased to keep it unshaken and immovable by any storms or tempests, to the end of the world. We pray also for the whole episcopacy (or universal college of bishops) rightly dividing the word of truth. We pray for me, thy unworthy servant, who am now offering unto thee; and for the whole presbytery, and deacons, and all the clergy, that thou wouldst give them all wisdom, and fill them with thy Holy Spirit. We pray thee, O Lord, for the king, and all that are in authority, and for the whole army, that our affairs may be transacted in peace: that, passing our time in quietness and concord, we may glorify thee through Jesus Christ, our hope, all the days of our life. We offer unto thee, for all thy saints, that have lived well-pleasing in thy sight, from the foundation of the world; for patriarchs, prophets, holy men, apostles, martyrs, bishops, confessors, presbyters, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names thou knowest. We offer unto thee, for this people, that thou wouldst make them, to the glory of thy Christ, a royal priesthood and a holy nation; for all that live in virginity and chastity; for the widows of the Church; for all that live in honest marriage, and procreation of children; for the infants of thy people, that none of us be a castaway. We pray thee for this city, and all that dwell therein; for those that are in sickness, in cruel bondage and slavery, in banishment, or

προσφέροντάς σοι οὐδινίας, καὶ ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου, ὑπὲρ τῶν διακόνων καὶ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου, ἵνα πάντας σοφίσας, Πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρώσῃς· ἔτι παρακαλοῦμί σοι, Κύριε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλείου, καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ στρατοπέδου, ἵνα εἰρηνύωνται τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅπως ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ ἁμονίᾳ διάγοντες τὸν πάντα χρόνον τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν, δοξάζωμέν σοι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν· ἔτι προσφέρω σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος εὐαρεστησάντων σοι ἁγίων, πατρι-αρχῶν, προφητῶν, δικαίων, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὁμολογητῶν, ἱσχυροτάτων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, ὑποδιακόνων, ἀναγιστῶν, ψαλτῶν, παρθένων, χηρῶν, λαϊκῶν, καὶ πάντων ὧν αὐτοὶ ἐπίστασαι τὰ ὀνόματα· ἔτι προσφέρω σοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου· ἵνα ἀναδείξῃς αὐτὸν εἰς ἱπταίνον τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου βασιλίου ἱεράτευμα, ἴθους ἄγιον· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν παρθένοιᾳ καὶ ἀγνείᾳ, ὑπὲρ τῶν χηρῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν σιμνοῖς γάμοις καὶ τιμωροποιίαις, ὑπὲρ τῶν νηπίων τοῦ λαοῦ σου, ὅπως μηδὲν ἡμῶν ἀπόβλητον ποιήσῃς· ἔτι ἀξιούμεν σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης καὶ τῶν ἐνοικούντων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀρρώστιας, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πικρᾷ δουλείᾳ, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἐξορίαις, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν θημύσει, ὑπὲρ πλούντων καὶ ὁδοπορούντων· ὅπως ἐπίκουρος γίνῃ πάντων βοηθὸς καὶ ἀντιλήπτωρ· ἔτι παρακαλοῦμί σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς καὶ διωκόντων ἡμᾶς διὰ τὸ ὄνομα σου,

under confiscation and proscription ; for all that travel by sea or by land, that thou wouldst be their succour, and a universal helper and defender to them all. We pray thee for those that hate us, and persecute us for thy name ; for them that are yet without, and wandering in error, that thou wouldst convert them to good, and mitigate their fury. We pray thee for the catechumens of the Church ; for the energumens, that are tossed and tormented by the adversary the devil ; for all our brethren that are doing penance ; that thou wouldst perfect the former in faith ; and cleanse and deliver the second from the power and agitation of the wicked one ; and receive the repentance of the last, and pardon both them and us whatever offences we have committed against thee. We offer unto thee, likewise, for the temperature of the air, and the increase of the fruits of the earth, that we, continually partaking of those good things which thou bestowest on us, may, without ceasing, praise thee, who givest food unto all flesh. We also pray for those who, upon any just and reasonable cause, are now absent, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to preserve us all in godliness, and, keeping us without change, blame, or rebuke, to gather us into the kingdom of thy Christ, the God of all things in nature, visible and invisible, and our King. For to thee, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is due all glory, and worship, and thanksgiving, and honour, and adoration, now and for ever, throughout all ages, world without end.' And let all the people answer, 'Amen.'

ὕπὲρ τῶν ἔξω ὄντων καὶ πειλαυμένων, ὅπως ἐπιστρέψῃς αὐτοὺς εἰς ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸν θυμὸν αὐτῶν προαύγῃς· ἔτι παρακαλοῦμέν σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν καταχουμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν χιμαζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁλλοτρίου, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μετανόῳι ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν· ὅπως τοὺς μὲν τιλιώσῃς ἐν τῇ πίστει, τοὺς δὲ καθαρίσῃς ἐκ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῶν διὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν προσδέξῃ, καὶ συγχωρήσῃς καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν· ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐκρασίας τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τῆς εὐφορίας τῶν καρπῶν· ὅπως ἀνιλλιπῶς μεταλαμβάνοντες τῶν παρὰ σοῦ ἀγαθῶν, αἰνοῦμέν σοι ἀπαύστως, τὸν δίδοντα τροφὴν πάσῃ σαρκί· ἔτι παρακαλοῦμέν σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν δι' ἐλλογον αἰτίαν ἀπόντων· ὅπως ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς διατηρήσας ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ, ἐπισυναγάγῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τοῦ Θεοῦ πάσης αἰσθητῆς καὶ νοητῆς φύσεως, τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν, ἀτρίπτους, ἀμίμπτους, ἀνιγκλήτους· ὅτι σοι πᾶσα δόξα, εἰς ἃς καὶ εὐχαριστία, τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀνιλλίπτους καὶ ἀτελιυτέτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς λέγῃτω, Ἀμήν.

After this, the bishop is appointed to say again, "The peace of God be with you all:" to which the people answer, "And with thy spirit." And then the deacon calls upon the people to join with him in another prayer, which is termed *προσφώνησις*, &c. A bidding-prayer for the faithful, after the Divine oblation in these words: "Let us pray yet again and again to God, by his Christ, for this gift which is offered to the Lord God; that the good God would receive it to his altar in heaven, for a sweet-smelling savour, by the mediation of his Christ. Let us pray for this Church and people: for the whole society of bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, and ministers, and the whole Catholic Church; that the Lord would keep and preserve them all. Let us pray for kings, and all that are in authority; that our affairs may go on with tranquillity, and that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty. Let us commemorate the holy martyrs, that we may be thought worthy to have fellowship in their conflicts and engagements. Let us pray for those that rest in faith; let us pray for the temperature of the air, and increase of the fruits of the earth, that they may grow to perfection. Let us pray for those that are newly baptized, that they may be confirmed in faith. Let us all exhort and excite one another. Let us rise and commend ourselves to God by his grace." Then let the bishop say: "O God, that are great, great in name, great in counsel, and mighty in works; the God and Father of thy holy Son

* Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiii. "Ετι καὶ ἴτι δηθῶμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὑπὲρ τοῦ δώρου τοῦ προσκομισθέντος Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅπως ὁ ἀγαθὸς Θεὸς προσδίδῃται αὐτὸ διὰ τῆς μισιτίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἰουδαῖον αὐτοῦ θυσιαστήριον, εἰς ὁμὴν ἰωδίας· ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ταύτης καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ δηθῶμιν, ὑπὲρ πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς, παντὸς πρεσβυτερίου, πάσης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας καὶ ὑπηρεσίας, παντὸς τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας δηθῶμιν· ὅπως ὁ Κύριος πάντας διατηρήσῃ καὶ διαφυλάξῃ· ὑπὲρ βασιλείων καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ δηθῶμιν· ἵνα ἱερνεύουνται τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅπως ἤριμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον ἔχοντες, διάγονται ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ εὐμνησίᾳ· τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων μνημονεύσωμεν, ὅπως κοινωνοὶ γινώσκει τῆς ἀλήθειας αὐτῶν καταξιοθῶμεν· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστι ἀναπαυσαμένων δηθῶμιν· ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπερασσίας τῶν αἱρῶν καὶ τιλικοφρίας τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν δηθῶμιν· ὑπὲρ τῶν νοσημάτων δηθῶμιν· ὅπως βεβαιωθῶσιν ἐν τῇ πίστι πάντες ὑπὸ ἄλλων παρακαλίσθωσαν· ἀνάστησον ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ χάριτί σου ἀναστάντες ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ παραβῶμεθα καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος λιγίτω, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ μεγαλύνωμεν, ὁ μέγας τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ κραταῖς τοῖς ἔργοις, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ ἀγίου παιδὸς σου Ἰησοῦ τοῦ

Jesus our Saviour ; look favourably upon us, and this thy flock, which thou hast chosen in him, to the glory of thy name. Sanctify our bodies and souls ; and grant that we, being pure from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, may obtain the good things that are set before us ; and that thou mayest judge none of us unworthy, but be our helper, defender, and protector, through thy Christ ; to whom, with thee and the Holy Spirit, be glory, honour, and praise, doxology and thanksgiving for ever. Amen."

And when all the people have said "Amen," let the deacon cry again, *Πρόσχωμεν*, 'Let us give attention.' Then the bishop shall speak to the people, saying, *Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*, 'Holy things for those that are holy.' And the people shall answer, "There is one Holy, one Lord, one Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father, blessed for ever. Amen. Glory be to God on high, and in earth peace, goodwill towards men. Hosanna to the Son of David : blessed be the Lord God, that came in the name of the Lord, and manifested himself unto us : Hosanna in the highest."

This is the whole service preceding the act of communicating, as it is delivered in the Constitutions ; which I have here represented all together, as it lies there, that the reader may see it in one view. I shall now compare the several parts and branches of it with the certain accounts we have of them in other authentic writers ; beginning with that which was the first in order,—the minister's salutation of the people.

SECT. II.—*This Account compared with what is said in other Authors. First, As to the Form of Salutation, "Peace be with you," &c.*

It has been observed before,^d that this form of saluting the people, by saying, "Peace be with you," or, "The Lord be with you," or, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c. be with you," was the usual preface and introduction to all holy

Ἐν τῷ ἑσθίῳ, ἐπιτίθειν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνιον σου τοῦτο, ὃ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐξελίξῃς εἰς δόξαν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου καὶ ἁγιασῇς ἡμᾶς τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, καταξίωσον καθαρὸς γινώσκοντας ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, τυχεῖν τῶν προνομιῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ μηδὲνα ἡμῶν ἀνάξιον κρίνῃς, ἀλλὰ βοηθὸς ἡμῶν γινού, ἀντιλήπτωρ, ὑπερασπιστὴς διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου μὴδ' οὐ σοὶ δόξα, τιμὴ, αἶνος, δόξα, λογία, εὐχαριστία, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

^d Book xiv. chap. iv. sect. xiv. vol. iv. p. 561.

offices, and, therefore, always used before prayers, especially those that were offered up at the altar. Theodoret says it was used both at the entrance of their sermons and the mystical service;^e by which he means this part of the communion-office. Cyril of Alexandria says the same,^f that they used it in the beginning of their mysteries; and that Christ made it a law, as it were, unto the Church, by saying so often to his disciples, "Peace be unto you." But no one speaks more fully of it than St. Chrysostom. He says,^g "They used it in all their offices; when they first came into the church; when they preached; when they gave the benediction; when they commanded the people to salute one another with the kiss of peace; when the sacrifice was offered, and, at other times, in the communion-service." Where, it is observable, that he speaks of this salutation as used, four times at least, in this part of the communion-office, besides other occasions. In another place, exhorting Christians not to follow the customs of the Jews, but to be at unity and peace among themselves, he uses this argument,^h "There is nothing comparable to peace and concord. Therefore, when the bishop first enters the church, before ever he goes up to his throne, he says, 'Peace be unto you all:;' when he rises up to preach, he does not begin, before he has given the 'Peace to all:;' when the priests are about to make the benediction-prayers, they first use this salutation, and then begin their benediction. So also the deacon, when he bids you pray in common, among other things, he reminds you to pray for the 'angel of peace:;' and when he dismisses you from this assembly, he prays for you in the same manner, saying, 'Go in peace.' And there is nothing at all said or done without this." In

^e Theodoret. Ep. cxlvi. p. 1032. Τοῦτο ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς μυστικῆς ἱστοῦ λειτουργίας προεῖμνον. (iv. p. 1260.)

^f Cyril. lib. xii. in Joan. p. 1093. Κατασπάζεται δὲ πάλιν, τὸ σύνθημα ἐκείνο λίγων, τοῦτ' ἔστιν εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, νόμον ὁσπέρ τινα καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τούτῳ τιθεῖς τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνοις· ταιγάρτοι καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαις μάλιστα συνόδοις, ἥτοι συνάξεσι, παρ' αὐτὰς τοῦ μυστηρίου ἄρχας, τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλήλους φαιμέν.

^g Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Coloss. p. 1338, (p. 173, edit. Francof.) "Ὅταν εἰσέλθῃ ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προϊστάς, εὐθὺς λίγου, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν ἱμελῇ, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· ὅταν εὐλογῇ, Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν· καὶ μετὰ τὸ πάλιν, Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη.

^h Ibid. Hom. lii. in eos qui pascha jejunant, tom. v. p. 713, (Hom. lv. p. 367, edit. cit.) Vid. Bingham, lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. v. vol. iv. p. 278.

another homily, upon the descent of the Holy Ghost, he gives the reason why it was more particularly used at the Lord's table. "The bishop," says he,ⁱ "not only when he goes into his throne, and when he preaches, and when he prays, uses this form, but when he stands at this holy table, when he is about to offer the tremendous sacrifice, he does not touch the oblation, before he has prayed that the 'Grace of the Lord may be with you,' and ye have answered, 'And with thy spirit : ' by which answer ye remind yourselves, that it is not the minister who effects any thing in this matter, neither is the consecration of the gifts there lying the work of human nature ; but that it is the grace of the Spirit then present, and descending upon the elements, that makes this mystical sacrifice." There are several other passages to the same purpose in his other homilies upon the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles,^j which, because the reader may find them at large in the extract of the liturgy above, out of St. Chrysostom's works, I will not here repeat them. The same custom was always observed in the Latin Church. For Tertullian plainly refers to it, when he objects to the heretics,^k "That they gave 'the peace' to all, without exception," implying that the Church used it, but with some distinction. Optatus says, the Donatists retained the form, but grossly abused it in their practice. They could not omit the solemn words : "They said, 'Peace be unto you.' But why," says he,^l "dost thou salute men with that, which thou hast not? Why dost thou name peace that hast destroyed it? Thou salutest men with the words of love and peace, who hast nothing of the reality and substance of it." In the Spanish Church, they used a like form, though not altogether the

ⁱ Chrysostom. Hom. xxxvi. de Pentecoste, tom. v. p. 553, (Hom. xxxix. p. 493, fin. seq.) — (See Bingham, vol. iv. p. 278.)

^j Ibid. Hom. xvii. in 2 Cor. p. 873, Bingham, xiii. c. vi. vol. iv. p. 294. Hom. xxxvi. in 1 Cor. p. 652, Bingham, vol. iv. p. 292. Hom. xxxiii. in Matt. p. 318, Bingham, vol. iv. p. 286.

^k Tertul. de Præscript. c. xli. Paris. 1664, p. 217. Pacem cum omnibus miscent.

^l Optat. lib. iii. p. 73, (p. 79, edit. Paris. 1679.) Non potuistis prætermittere, quod legitimum est. Utique dixistis, 'Pax vobiscum' . . . Quid salutas, de quo non habes? Quid nominas, quod exterminasti? Salutas de pace, qui non amas.

same. For, by an order of the first Council of Braga,^m it was appointed, "That both bishops and presbyters should use one and the same form of salutation, that is, 'The Lord be with you,' as it is in the Book of Ruth; and that the people should answer, 'And with thy spirit:' as all the East receive it by tradition from the apostles, and not as the Priscillian heresy hath changed it." What change the Priscillianists had made in this matter, is not very clear: some learned men are of opinionⁿ that they would allow the bishops to use no other form but *Pax vobis*; and the presbyters only to say, *Dominus vobiscum*: whence they conclude that the word *Oriens*, 'the East,' must have crept into the canon, instead of 'the West;' because it is so evident, that all the Eastern Church used the form *Pax vobis*, both in the salutation of bishops and presbyters. But I should rather think the Priscillian pravity here complained of, was their denying the people the liberty of making their proper response, and bearing their part in the service, by saying, "And with thy spirit:" as had been the custom of all the East, from the time of the apostles. However this be, I cannot forbear to say, it is the very error and pravity, which the Church of Rome has since run into. For Bona owns himself,^o that though it was customary, in the

^m Conc. Bracar. I. c. xxi. (al. Conc. II. c. iii. tom. v. Conc. p. 240, edit. Labb.) Placuit, ut non aliter episcopi, et aliter presbyteri populum, sed uno modo salutent, dicentes, 'Dominus sit vobiscum:' sicut in libro Ruth legitur; et ut respondeatur a populo, 'Et cum spiritu tuo:' sicut et ab ipsis apostolis traditum omnis retinet Oriens, et non sicut Priscilliana pravitas immutavit.

ⁿ Garsias Louisa [or Garcia de Loaisa] in loc. (p. 844, *ibid.*) In missis privatis, et in solemnioribus, prima vice episcopus salutatur hac forma, 'Pax vobis;' postea dicitur, 'Dominus vobiscum;' sicuti sacerdos: quod Priscillianus negabat, adfirmans, esse 'Pax vobis' tantum ab episcopo dicendum semper; a sacerdote vero, 'Dominus vobiscum.' — Bon. de Reb. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. v. n. i. p. 319. Priscillianus, ut ad hunc canonem notat Garsias Louisa, non semel tantum, ut moris est, sed semper ab episcopis dicendum esse 'Pax vobis' contendebat. In hunc autem canonem mendum irrepsisse, ut pro 'Occidens' 'Oriens' legatur, dudum viri docti observarunt. — Habert. Archieratic. p. 330. In Oriente episcopus dicit, 'Pax vobis;' et formula, *Κύριος μετ' ἡμῶν πάντων*, 'Dominus cum omnibus nobis,' in liturgia solum B. Marci, idque semel reperitur. Quid si 'Occidens' pro 'Oriente' legendum? — Hamon L'Estrange, Alliance of Div. Offic. chap. iii. p. 82.

^o Bon. *ibid.* p. 501, (p. 346, fin. edit. Paris. 1672, 4to.) Olim universus populi cœtus sacerdoti respondebat, ut ex liturgiis earumque expositionibus apparet; idque Micrologus statutum ait in Occidente a Concilio Aurelianensi, ut

ancient Church, for all the congregation, and not only the clerks, to answer the priest, by saying, "And with thy spirit;" yet now it is otherwise in the Church of Rome, where the clerks only make this response, and the people are wholly excluded from it. For which no other reason can be assigned, but the magisterial authority of that Church, pretending to prescribe what she pleases to the people, with a *non-obstante* to any rule or tradition of the ancient Church. St. Chrysostom's reasoning in behalf of the people's bearing a part in prayer with the priest, is of much more weight, and and with it I will conclude this paragraph.

"Great is the power of the congregation, that is, of the whole Church," says he.^p "It was their prayer that delivered Peter from his bonds, and opened the mouth of Paul. Their suffrage is a peculiar ornament to those who are called to the spiritual offices of government. And, therefore, he who is about to perform the office of ordination, at that time requires their prayers, and they join their suffrage, crying out in those words, which they that are initiated in the holy mysteries, know: for we may not speak all things openly before the unbaptized. There are some things wherein there is no difference between priest and people; as when they are to partake of the tremendous mysteries. For we are all alike admitted to them: not as under the Old Testament, when the priest eat one thing, and the people another; and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things which the priest alone might partake of. It is not so now, but there is one body, and one cup proposed in common to all. So, also, in the prayers, one may now observe the people

scilicet non solum clerici, sed omnis populus responderet, 'Et cum spiritu tuo.'
At nunc soli clerici, vel ministri respondent.

^p Chrysostom. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. p. 872, (p. 673, edit. Francof.) Μεγάλη ἡ δύναμις τῆς συνόδου, ἡ γουν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν [ἡ τῆς ἐκκλησίας] εὐχὴ τὸν Πίτερρον ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν ἔλυσε· τοῦ Παύλου τὸ στόμα ἠνέσχε· ἡ τοῦτων ψῆφος, οὐχ ὡς ἴτιυχι, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς πνευματικὰς ἀρχὰς ἐρχομένους κατακοσμεῖ. Διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μίλλων χυροτονεῖν, καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων εὐχὰς καλεῖ τότε, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπιφθερίζονται, καὶ ἐπιθεῶσιν, ὥστε Ἰσασιν οἱ μιμημένοι· οὐ γὰρ θίμις ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμυήτων ἐκκαλύπτειν ἅπαντα· ἴσσι δὲ, ὅπου οὐδὲ δίστασκειν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἀρχομένου οἶον, ὅταν ἀπολαύειν δῇ τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων ὁμοίως γὰρ πάντες ἀξιούμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν· οὐ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς, τὰ μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἤσθει, τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος· καὶ θίμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχιν ὧν μετέχιν

to contribute a great deal. For common prayers are made for the energumens, and for the penitents, both by the priests and people. For they all say that one and the same prayer, the prayer so full of mercy. Again, when we exclude those from the sanctuary, who cannot partake of the holy table, we are all obliged to make another prayer, in which we all fall down alike on the earth, and all rise up together. Again, when we are to give and receive 'the peace,' or 'kiss of peace,' we all, in like manner, salute each other. And, again, in celebrating the holy mysteries, the priest prays for the people, and the people for the priest. For these words, 'And with thy spirit,' are nothing else but the people's prayer. In like manner, the prayer of thanksgiving is a common prayer. For not only the priest gives thanks, but all the people also. For when he has first received their answer, declaring their consent, 'that it is meet and right so to do,' then he begins the thanksgiving. And why should you wonder that the people sometimes speak with the priest, when they are allowed to send up those holy hymns, in common with the very cherubims and celestial powers above? I have spoken all this (adds he), to make every member of the Church, though he be an inferior, to become watchful and vigilant; and to teach us, that we are all one body, and only differ from each other, as members do from the members of the same body; and that we should not cast all upon the

ὁ ἱερεὺς· ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν· ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σώμα πρόκειται, καὶ ποτήριον ἔν' καὶ ἐν ταῖς
 εὐχαῖς διὰ πολλὸν τὸν λαὸν ἰδοὶ τις ἂν συνισφίροντα· καὶ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων,
 ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ, κοιναὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως, καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν γίνονται αἱ
 εὐχαί· καὶ πάντες μίαν λίσσουσιν εὐχὴν, εὐχὴν τὴν ἰλίου γέμουσαν. πάλιν ἱπσιδὸν
 ἐξεξιμένον τῶν ἱερῶν περιβόλων τοὺς οὐ δυναμένους τῆς ἱερᾶς μετασχῆναι τραπέζης, ἰτίραν
 δι' ἐγίνεσθαι εὐχὴν, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως ἐκ' ἰδαφους κείμεθα, καὶ πάντες ὁμοίως
 ἀνιστάμεθα ὅταν εἰρήνης πάλιν μεταλαμβάνωμεν καὶ μεταδιδόναι διη, πάντες ὁμοίως
 ἀσπαζόμεθα. ἐκ' αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν φρικτοδιστάτων μυστηρίων ἐπιτύχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς τῇ
 λαῷ, ἐπιτύχεται καὶ ὁ λαὸς τῇ ἱερῇ· τὸ γὰρ, Μιστὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου, οὐδὲν ἕλλο
 ἔστιν, ἢ τοῦτο· τὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας πάλιν κοινά· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους εὐχαριστοῦν μόνους,
 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἅπας· πρότερον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαβὼν φωνὴν, ἵτα συντιθίμενων, ὅτι
 ἀξίως καὶ δικαίως τοῦτο γίνονται, τότε ἀρχεται τῆς εὐχαριστίας· καὶ τί θαυμάζεις,
 εἴ που μιστὰ τοῦ ἱερέως ὁ λαὸς φθίγγεται, ὅπουγί καὶ μιστ' αὐτῶν τῶν Χερουβίμ
 καὶ τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων κοινῇ, τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἐκείνους ἔμνους ἀναπέμπτει· ταῦτα δὲ μοι
 πάντα ἐκίνα εἴρηται, ἵνα ἕκαστος καὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων νήφῃ, ἵνα μάθωμεν, ὅτι σῶμά
 ἴσμεν ἅπαντες ἓν, τοσαύτην ἔχοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορὰν, ὅσην μίλιν πρὸς μίλιν·

priests, but every one bear his share in his concern for the whole Church, as one common body." I will now leave any ingenuous reader to judge, whose reasons are strongest and most rational; those of Chrysostom, who thus pleads the people's right in bearing a part in the public service of God; or theirs, who, by an overbearing authority, deny them their just right; and as they have taken away the cup, and the Bible, and the key of knowledge from them, so have also denied them the liberty of joining in common prayer with the priest; which was their uncontested privilege in the ancient Church.

SECT. III. — *Secondly, 'The Kiss of Peace.'*

But I proceed with the Constitutions. As there, immediately after the priest has given the salutation of peace, and the people have returned their answer, a deacon goes on to proclaim solemnly, that they should salute one another with 'a holy kiss:' and so the clergy salute the bishop; and laymen, their fellow-laymen; and women, one another. It is in the very same manner represented in other writers. The Council of Laodicea, describing the order of the ancient service, says,⁹ "After the prayers of the faithful, 'the peace' should be given: and after the presbyters have given 'the peace' to the bishop, and laymen 'the peace' to one another, the holy oblation should be offered." After the same manner, Cyril of Jerusalem^r speaks of it as coming before the *Sursum corda*, 'Lift up your hearts to the Lord.' "A deacon cries, 'Receive one another, salute one another, with a holy kiss.'" "Which," he says, "was a symbol of reconciliation, and forgiving all injuries whatsoever." St. Chrysostom^s

καὶ μὴ τὸ πᾶν ἐστὶ τοὺς ἱερείας ῥίπτωμιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ, ὡς πρὶς κοινοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσης οὕτω φροντίζωμεν.

⁹ Conc. Laodic. XIX. (i. p. 1500.) Εἴθ' οὕτως τὴν εἰρήνην διδόνθαι, καὶ μετὰ τοὺς πιστευόντας δοῦναι τῷ ἱεραπόστολῳ τὴν εἰρήνην, τότε τοὺς λαϊκοὺς τὴν εἰρήνην διδόναι· καὶ οὕτω τὴν ἁγίαν προσφορὰν ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.

^r Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. ii. (Paris. 1609, p. 534.) Εἴτα βοᾷ ὁ διάκονος, 'Ἀλλήλους ἀπολάβετε, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀσπαζώμεθα' . . . σημεῖον τοίνυν ἐστὶ τὸ φίλημα τοῦ ἀνακραθεῖναι τὰς ψυχὰς, καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξορίξιν μνησικακίαν. — Num. ii. demum sequitur. Μετὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ ἱερεὺς, "Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας.

^s Chrysostom. Hom. xx. in Matth. p. 205, (p. 249, edit. Francof.) Πῶς οὖν ἀσπάσῃ τὸν ἀδελφόν; πῶς ἄψῃ τῆς θυρίας; πῶς ἀπογοῖσθαι τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ διαποτικοῦ,

often mentions it, among other arguments, to excite men to unity and charity; reminding them of this symbol of peace and reconciliation, and how great a piece of pageantry and mere hypocrisy it was to give this kiss, as Judas did, without cordial love and sincere affection. Particularly in one place he notes the circumstance of time when this ceremony was used,¹ that is, before the oblation, when the sacrifice was about to be offered: which agrees exactly with the time specified in the Constitutions. The same is noted long before by Justin Martyr, that it was between the common prayers for the whole state of Christ's Church, and the prayers of consecration. "For," says he,² "when prayers are ended, we salute one another with a kiss: and, after that, bread, and wine and water, is brought to the president of the brethren; who, receiving them, gives praise and glory to the God of all things, in the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit." In the Latin Church, the same custom was observed, only with this difference; that it came not before,

τοσούτων ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς διανοίας [τὸν] ἰόν; — Hom. xiv. in Ephes. p. 1128, (p. 984, edit. Francof.) Φιλήματος ἡξίωσαι δισπότικοῦ, καὶ ὑερίζεις; τοσούτοις σου τὸ στόμα ἐκδόμηναι ὁ Θεὸς, ὕμνοις ἀγγελοῖς, τροφῇ οὐκίτι ἀγγελικῇ, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἀγγελικῆν, φιλήματι τῷ αὐτοῦ, περιπλοκαῖς ταῖς πρὸς αὐτόν; καὶ ὑερίζεις; μὴ, παρακαλῶ. — Hom. lxxvii. in Joan. p. 500, (ibid. edit. cit.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν μυστηρίοις ἀσπαζόμεθα ἀλλήλους, ἵνα οἱ πολλοὶ γινώμεθα ἓν. — Hom. xxx. de Produttore, tom. v. p. 565, (p. 416, edit. cit.) Μνημονεύωμιν διαπαντὸς τῶν ἁγίων φιλημάτων, καὶ τοῦ φρικωδιστάτου ἀσπασμοῦ τοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τοῦτο γὰρ συμπλίκει τὰς διανοίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ποιεῖ σῶμα γινώσθαι ἓν ἅπαντας, ἐπιυδὰν καὶ ἐνὸς σώματος μετίχομεν οἱ πάντες.

¹ Chrysostom. de Compunct. Cordis, lib. i. c. iii. tom. iv. p. 118, (p. 103, edit. Francof.) Ἀσπαζόμενοι μὲν ἀλλήλους μέλλοντος τοῦ δώρου προσφίεσθαι, χεῖρισιν δι' ὧς ἐπὶ τὸ πάλιν, καὶ στόματι τοῦτο ποιοῦντες μένον.

² Justin. Apol. i. p. 82, (Paris. 1742) Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν ὑψῶν ἱκετα προσφίεσται τῷ πριστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κρέματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Τιού, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, ἀναπίμπει. — Clement. Alex. Pædag. lib. iii. c. xi. p. 301, edit. Oxon. Ἀγάπη οὐκ ἐν φιλήματι, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑνόπῃ κρίνεται· οἱ δὲ, αὐτὸν ἀλλ' ἢ φιλήματι καταψοφούσι τὰς ἐκκλησίας, τὸ φιλεῖν ἔδον οὐκ ἔχοντες αὐτό· καὶ γὰρ δὴ, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκπίπληκειν ὑπονοίας αἰσχυρᾶς, καὶ βλασφημίας, τὸ ἀναίδην χρῆσθαι τῷ φιλήματι, ὅπερ ἔχρην εἶναι μυστικόν· ἅγιον αὐτὸ ἐκκλησίαν ὁ ἀπόστολος. — Atheug. Legat. pro Christianis, p. 76, d. Οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβῶσθαι τὸ φίλημα, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα διί. — Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. sect. viii. Οὕτω τῆς Διαρχικῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἱερῶς ὑμνήσεως, ἰγκλικαυμένους μὲν ὁ Θεὸς ἄρτος προστίθεται, καὶ τὸ τῆς εὐλογίας ποτήριον· ὁ δὲ Θεότατος ἀσπασμὸς ἱερωργεῖται, καὶ τῶν ἁγιογράφων πτυχῶν ἡ μυστικὴ καὶ ὑπερκύσιμος ἀνάρρησις.

but after, the consecration-prayers; and the Lord's Prayer, immediately before the distribution. For so St. Austin, or Cæsarius Arelatensis, represents it, in describing the order of the service.^w "When the consecration is ended, we say the Lord's Prayer; and, after that, 'Peace be with you:' and then Christians salute one another with a 'holy kiss,' which is a sign of peace, if that be really in their hearts which they pretend with their lips." He mentions the thing in other places, and seems to intimate, that the Donatists observed the same ceremony, though they had nothing of the peace that was intended by it. In his books against Petilian, speaking of one Optatus Gildonianus, a Donatist bishop, who had been a great oppressor of widows and orphans, and infamous for many other barbarous cruelties, he says,^x "Notwithstanding all this, they gave him 'the kiss of peace,' when they received the sacrament at his hands." In another place,^y he compares the Donatists to crows, and the Catholics to doves; because, though they both gave 'the kiss of peace,' yet the one tare the Church in pieces, and fed upon its ruins; but the other were innocent and harmless as doves; and, by those characters, they might be distinguished from each other. It appears also, from Pope Innocent's letter to Decentius,^z bishop of Eugubium, that it was the

^w Aug. Hom. lxxxiii. de Diversis, tom. x. p. 556. (Antwerp. vol. v. p. 678.) Ubi peracta est sanctificatio, dicimus Orationem Dominicam. Post ipsam dicitur, 'Pax vobiscum;' et osculantur se Christiani in osculo, quod est signum pacis; si, quod [or sicut] ostendunt labia, fiat in conscientia.

^x Ibid. cont. Litter. Petilian, lib. ii. c. xxiii. (tom. vii. p. 102, edit. Basil. 1569.) Huc accedit, quia ego illum commemoro, qui vobiscum vixit, cujus natalitia tanta celebratione frequentabatis, cui pacis osculum inter sacramenta copulabatis, in cujus manibus eucharistiam ponebatis, &c. (Vol. ix. p. 158, D. 10.)

^y Ibid. Tract. vi. in Joan, p. 21, (p. 50, cit. edit.) Habent oscula et corvi, sed in corvis falsa pax, in columba vera pax. Non omnis ergo, qui dicit, 'Pax vobiscum,' quasi columba audiendus est. Unde ergo discernuntur oscula corvorum ab oculis columbarum? Osculantur corvi, sed laniant: a laniatu innocens est natura columbarum. Ubi ergo laniatus, non est vera in oculis pax. Illi habent veram pacem, qui ecclesias non laniaverunt: nam corvi de morte pascuntur, hoc columba non habet. (iii. p. 242, B. 7.)

^z Innocent. Epist. i. ad Decent. c. i. Pacem adseris, ante confecta mysteria quosdam populis imperare, vel sibi inter sacerdotes tradere: quum post omnia, quæ aperire non debeo, pax sit necessario indicenda, per quam constet, populum,

general custom of the Italic Churches to give 'the kiss of peace,' not before the consecration, but after: for it blames those that gave it before; and says, it ought to come after, as a testimony of their consent to all that was done, and as a seal of the consecration-prayer, to signify that all was ended. Tertullian,^a probably, upon this account, gave it the name of *signaculum orationis*, 'the seal of their prayers;' as being, in their time, used when all the prayers of consecration were ended. He seems to intimate, also, that it was given promiscuously, and without distinction, between men and women. For, among other arguments, which he uses why a Christian woman should not marry a heathen, this is one,^b "That he would be unwilling to suffer her to go into the prisons to kiss the martyr's chains; or, at any other times, to give 'the kiss of peace' to a brother." And this is as plainly intimated by the ancient writer of the Passion of Felicitas and Perpetua, about Tertullian's time, when he says,^c "That Felicitas, Perpetua, and Saturus, did mutually kiss each other before they suffered, that they might consummate their martyrdom by the solemn rite of peace:" alluding to the usual custom of giving 'the kiss of peace' without distinction, though it was otherwise observed in the Greek Church. There is one thing more proper to be observed out of Tertullian, that some made a scruple of giving 'the kiss of peace' upon a fast-day, though it were but a private fast of their own; whom he reproves, telling them,^d "That 'the kiss of peace' was the seal of prayer;

ad omnia, quæ in mysteriis aguntur, atque in ecclesia celebrantur, præbuisse consensum, ac finita esse pacis concludentis signaculo demonstrantur.

^a Tertul. de Orat. c. xiv. p. 134. Alia jam consuetudo invaluit, jejunantes habita oratione cum fratribus subtrahunt osculum pacis, quod est signaculum orationis.

^b Ibid. ad Uxor. lib. ii. c. iv. p. 169, D. Quis in carcerem ad osculanda vincula martyris reptare patietur? jam vero alicui fratrum ad osculum convenire?

^c Passio Perpetuæ ad Calcem Lact. de Mort. Persecut. p. 35. Ante jam osculati invicem, ut martyrium per solemniam pacis consummarent.

^d Tertul. de Orat. c. xiv. (Paris. 1664, p. 134, C.) Alia jam consuetudo invaluit, jejunantes habita oratione cum fratribus subtrahunt osculum pacis, quod est signaculum orationis. Quando autem magis conferenda cum fratribus pax est, nisi cum oratio commendabilior adscendit, ut ipsi de nostra operatione participes, jam audeant de sua pace fratri transigere? Quæ oratio cum divortio sancti osculi integra, quem Domino officium facientem impedit pax? Quale sacrificium

that it was never more proper, than when joined with prayer; that there was no prayer perfect without peace; that peace was no impediment to a man in doing his duty to the Lord; that whatever reason they had for it, their reason was not stronger than the observation of the precept which obliges us to conceal our fasts; whereas, when we refrain from 'the kiss of peace,' that discovers us to be fasting. We may, at home, omit this ceremony of 'giving the peace,' because there our fasts cannot be wholly concealed from the family: but, in other places, where you may conceal your action, you ought to remember the precept of the Lord; and so you may observe the discipline of the Church abroad, and your own custom at home." Tertullian, we see, speaks this of private fasts, which he thinks no reason for men's refusing 'the kiss of peace' in public. As to public fasts, the case was otherwise. For, by the laws of the Church, this ceremony was omitted on some more solemn days of fasting: as upon the day of our Saviour's Passion. For Tertullian adds immediately in the next words,* "That on that day, because it was a public and common fast, ordained by the laws of the Church, they omitted 'the kiss of peace;' and no one then regarded the omission, because it was done by general consent and agreement." And this seems to have been an exception of universal extent in the Church: for Procopius notes it in the Life of Justinian and Theodora,^f who began their reign on this day (an. 527), that they began it with an ill omen, on a day that no one used 'the kiss of peace' in the Church. And thus much of this ancient ceremony, so often enjoined by the apostle (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20;

est, a quo sine pace receditur? Quæcumque operatio sit, non erit potior præcepti observatione, quo jubemur jejunia nostra celare. Jam enim de abstinencia osculi agnoscimur jejunantes. Sed et si qua ratio est, ne tamen huic præcepto reus sis, potes domi, si forte, inter quos latere jejunium in totum non datur, differre pacem. Ubicumque autem alibi operationem tuam abscondere potes, debes meminisse præcepti: ita et disciplinæ foris, et consuetudini domi satisfacies.

* Tertul. de Orat. c. xiv. Die Paschæ quo communis et quasi publica jejunii religio est, merito deponimus osculum, nihil curantes de osculando, quod cum omnibus faciamus.

^f Procop. Histor. Arcan. c. ix. Παρίλαβον τὴν βασιλείαν Ἰουστινιανὸς τε καὶ Θεοδώρα πρότερον τῆς ἱερτῆς ἡμέραις τρισὶν, ὅτε δὴ οὔτε ἀσπάσασθαι τινα, οὔτε εἰρηναῖα προσμιπὶν ἔχιστιν.

2 Cor. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 26; 1 Pet. v. 14). Of which some have written whole volumes:^s but I content myself to have said so much, as may serve to confirm the observation made upon the author of the Constitutions, that this was an ancient rite universally observed in the Church in one part or other of the communion-service.

SECT. IV.—*Thirdly, Washing of Hands before Consecration.*

The next thing mentioned in the Constitutions, is the ceremony of the priest's washing his hands before consecration. This is also noted by Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Mystagogical Explication of the Communion-Service; where, speaking to the newly baptized, he says,^h “Ye have seen the deacon bring water to the bishop and presbyters standing about the altar, to wash their hands. Did he give it to wash the filth of their bodies? By no means. For we do not use to go into the church with bodies defiled: but that washing of hands is a symbol, that you ought to be pure from sin and transgressions of the law. For the hands are the symbol of action; and washing them denotes the purity and cleanness of our actions. Have you not heard holy David explaining this mystery, and saying, ‘I will wash my hands among the innocent, and so will I compass thine altar, O Lord?’ Therefore, washing the hands is a symbol or indication, that we are not obnoxious or liable unto sin.” The author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament, under the name of St. Austin,ⁱ takes notice of the same

^s Mullerus de Osculo Sancto, Jenæ, 1675, 4to. Martinus Kempius de Osculo, &c. Lipsiæ, 1565.

^h Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. i. p. 534. Ἐωράκατε τὸν διάκονον, τὸν νίψασθαι δίδόντα τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ τοῖς κυκλοῦσι τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ περιεστυρίους; οὐ πάντως δι' ἰδίδου διὰ τὸν σωματικὸν ῥύπον· οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο· οὐτὶ γὰρ ῥύπον σώματος ἔχοντες τὴν ἀρχὴν, εἰσήμεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ἀλλὰ σύμβολόν ἐστι τοῦ διὲν ὑμᾶς καθαρεύειν πάντων ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ ἀνομιμάτων, τὸ νίψασθαι· ἰασιδὴ γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες σύμβολον πράξεως, νίψασθαι ταύτας, τὸ καθαρὸν δηλοῖ καὶ ἄμωμον τῶν πράξεων αἰνιγμένον· οὐκ ἤκουσας τοῦ μακαρίου Δαβὶδ αὐτὸ τοῦτο μυσταγωγούντος, καὶ λέγοντος, Νίψομαι ἐν ἀθροῖς τὰς χεῖράς μου, καὶ κυκλώσω τὸ θυσιαστήριόν σου, Κύριε· οὐκοῦν τὸ νίψασθαι τὰς χεῖρας, τοῦ ἀνυψώθηναι εἶναι ἁμαρτήμασι, σύμβολόν ἐστιν.

ⁱ Aug. Quæst. Vet. et Novi Test. Quæst. ci. Quamquam Romanæ ecclesiæ diaconi modico inverecundiores videantur, sedendi tamen dignitatem non præsumunt. Ut autem non omnia ministeria obsequiorum per ordinem agant, mul-

custom as used in all Churches, only with this difference; that, whereas in other Churches it was commonly the office of the deacons to bring water to priests, in the Roman Church it was devolved upon the sub-deacons; because there was a multitude of inferior clergy in that Church, above many others. And in the author under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, a great deal more may be read to the same purpose.

SECT. V.—*Fourthly, The Deacon's Admonition to all Non-Communicants to withdraw; and to all Communicants to come in Charity and Sincerity.*

In the next place, whereas, in the Constitutions, the deacon is appointed again to make a solemn proclamation, ordering all non-communicants, catechumens, penitents, and unbelievers, to be excluded; and admonishing all communicants to approach in charity and sincerity, not in enmity with their brethren, or in hypocrisy towards God, but in reverence and fear; the very same is suggested by Chrysostom:^j “Dost thou not hear the deacon, the herald of the Church, standing and crying, ‘All ye that are under penance, begone?’ All they that do not partake of the communion, are in penance. If thou art in penance, thou mayest not partake.” And Severianus, bishop of Gabala, in one of his homilies among St. Chrysostom’s works, speaks of the same:^k “Ye have seen the deacons traversing the church, and crying, ‘Let no catechumen be present, none of those that may not see the heavenly blood shed for the remission of sins,’ &c. Ye remember, after this, how the angels from heaven sing the hymns and praises, saying, ‘Holy is the Father, holy is the Son, holy is the Holy Ghost.’”^l By which it is plain,

titudo facit clericorum. Nam utique et altare portarent et vasa ejus, et aquam in manus funderent sacerdoti, sicut videmus per omnes ecclesias, &c. (iii. 2d part. Append. p. 77, A.)

^j Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051, (p. 888, edit. Francof.) Ἀκούεις ἰσῳῳτος τοῦ κήρυκος, καὶ λίγοντος, “Ὅσοι ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἀπὸλθετε πάντες” ὅσοι μὴ μετρίχουσιν, ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰσὶν εἰ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰ, μετασχῶν οὐκ ὀφείλεις.

^k Ap. Chrysostom. tom. vi. hom. xxxvii. de Filio Prodigio, p. 375, (p. 313, edit. cit.) Ἐπίστασθε, κ. τ. λ.—Vid. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. vi. p. 283.

^l Chrysostom. Hom. i. cont. Judæos, tom. i. p. 400, (p. 389, b. edit. cit.) Οὐχ ἰρῶντες ἐν τῶν μυστηρίῳ, τί βοᾷ συνελθῶνς ὁ διάκονος; Ἐπιγινώσκοντες ἀλλήλους.

these admonitions of the deacon were here repeated as preparatory to the oblation.

SECT. VI.—*Of the ῥιπίδια, or 'Fans' to drive away Insects.*

The circumstance of the ῥιπίδια, or 'fans' to drive away the insects, is so minute, that it is no great wonder it should be omitted in most other writers, beside the Constitutions. Bona^m says they are mentioned in Jobiusⁿ and Germanus's *Theoria*, and the liturgies that go under the name of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil. Suicerus^o thinks, that, in most of those writings, the word ῥιπίδια, signifies one of their 'holy vessels,' a basket or the like, in which they were used to carry the sacred elements to and from the altar; such as that spoken of by St. Jerom, when describing the glorious poverty of Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, he says,^p "He was used to carry the Lord's body in a basket of osiers; and the blood, in a glass cup." And, indeed, in Herodotus, the word ῥιπίδιον

^m Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xxv. n. vi. p. 294. Habent denique flabella, quibus duo diaconi, ex utroque latere altaris, muscas et alias immundas bestiolas prætervolantes abigunt, ne sacra contingant. Sacra ῥιπίδια vocant Græci, ῥιπίς enim et ῥιπίδιον flabellum est. Horum usus in ecclesia Orientali antiquissimus est; et expressæ habetur in Constitutionibus Apostolicis, lib. viii. c. xii. atque in liturgiis Basilii, Chrysostomi, aliisque Græcis et Syriacis. Manubrium habent ligneum satis longum, cujus extremitati facies Cherubini sex alis circumdata adfigitur, ejusque motu ventilant diaconi sancta dona certis temporibus, quæ in ordine liturgiæ notantur. Quod si desint flabella, solent linteola et vela manu apprehendere et iis ventilare. Nec solum ad abigendas muscas inventa sunt, sed etiam propter quasdam mysticas rationes, quæ ad meum propositum non spectant, et legi possunt apud S. Germanum in sua *Theoria*, et apud Jobium monachum relatum a Photio in sua *Bibliotheca*, Cod. ccxxii. lib. vi. c. xxv.

ⁿ Jobius ap. Phot. cod. ccxxii. p. 607. Λίγυι δὲ καὶ τοῦ πυριακοῦ σώματος ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης προτιθέντος, διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς παρ' ἑκάστηρα τῶν τὰ ἱερὰ ὑπηρετουμένων, ῥιπίδας πτερῶν πιπονημένας, τοῖς προκειμένοις φρικτοῖς ἱπικινῶν τῶν ἑξαπτερέγων φέροντας σύμβολα ὡς ἂν μὴ ἰῶσι τοὺς τιλουμένους τοῖς ὀρμίνουσιν ἱναπομίνυν, ἀλλὰ παντὸς προσύλου ὑπεράνω γινομένους νοικοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, διὰ τῶν ὀρμίνων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀόρατον Σίαν καὶ τὸ ἀμήχανον ἐκίνο κάλλος παρασκυιάζουσιν ἀναδραμεῖν.

^o Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 905. 'Ῥιπίς est 'vas e vimine, in ῥίπου contextum;' unde ῥιπίδιον, 'corbis, canistrum, sporta e calamis seu virgis plexa,' in ᾧ τὰ φορετῖα, quidquid portari de loco in locum solet, ἱπικινῆσθαι. Usus talium fuisse in sacris ecclesiæ veteris Hieronymus Epist. ad Rusticum monachum de Exuperio episcopo Tolosæ docuerit; 'Nihil,' inquires, &c.—See following note.

^p Hieron. Epist. v. ad Rustic. Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro. (vol. i. p. 947, E.)

is, by some lexicographers, said to signify 'a basket;' but in the liturgies of St. Chrysostom and Basil, it is taken in the common sense of Greek authors, and as it is used in the Constitutions, for 'a fan to blow with.' For, in Chrysostom's Liturgy,^a the deacon is to ventilate, or blow over, the elements, with 'a fan;' or if there be no fan, then to do it with the covering of the cup. And, in St. Basil's Liturgy,^r there is mention made of the same utensils, *ρίπιδιον ἢ κάλυμμα*, 'either the fan or the covering of the cup,' to be used for the same purpose. And so the word *ρίπιδιον* is taken by Germanus,^s and Jobius, and Suidas. So that there was no reason for Suicerus to reckon the author of the Constitutions so singular in this opinion. But as these authors are not very ancient, I have mentioned them rather to explain a hard word, than to establish an ecclesiastical custom. St. Jerom's authority is produced by Durantus;^t but it is nothing to the purpose: for though he mentions the use of *muscaria*,^u that is, 'fans;' yet it is plain he speaks of them not as any ecclesiastical utensil, but as a civil present made by Marcella to the matrons; though he gives a tropological turn of wit, to draw something of a mystical meaning out of them. So I let this matter pass as a minute circumstance in the Constitutions, about which it is not worth our while to be further solicitous in our inquiries, to give collateral evidence out of the ancient writers.

^a Chrysostom. Liturg. Bibl. Patr. Gr.-Lat. tom. ii. p. 78. Ἐτα μεταβαίνειν ἐν τῷ δεξιῷ μίρῳ, καὶ ρίπιζεν ἐπάνω τῶν ἁγίων μετὰ ριπιδίου εὐλαβῶς· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι ριπιδιον, ποιῇ τοῦτο μετὰ καλύμματος.

^r Basil. Liturg. ibid. p. 51. Ὁ διάκονος ἀποτίθῃσι τὸ ριπιδιον, ὅπερ ἐκράτει, ἢ κάλυμμα, καὶ ἔρχεται ἐγγύστερον τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ προσκυνῶσι ἀμφοτέρω τριῖς ἱμπεροῦσιν τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης.

^s German. Contemplat. Rer. Eccles. ibid. p. 457. Τί δ' (ἂν τις εἴποι) περὶ τῶν θείων ριπιδίων ἡγεχυρισμένων τοῖς διακόναις, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν στρεφόμενων αἰφνιδίως, ὡς ἐν ἱερωμένῳ, ἄχρι τῆς θολικαίου προσευχῆς; — Jobius, ap. Photium, cod. ccxxii. Vid. supra, sub litt. (°). — Suidæ, Lexic. tom. ii. p. 686, (tom. iii. p. 261, edit. Kusteri.) Ριπίδα τὴν μαλακοῖσιν αἰὶ πρηγῶν αἰτάις.

^t Durant. de Ritibus, lib. i. c. x. de Muscariis et Flabellis, n. ii. — S. Hieron. Epist. xx. ad Marcellam interpretando mystice munuscula ei ac Paulæ et Eustochio a Marcella sit, 'Quod autem et matronis,' &c. See following note.

^u Hieron. Epist. xx. ad Marcellam. Quod autem et matronis offertis muscaria parva, parvis animalibus eventilandis, elegans significatio est, debere luxuriam cito restringere; quia muscæ morituræ, oleum suavitatis exterminant. (Bened. Venet. vol. i. p. 195, A.)

SECT. VII.—*Of the Use of the Sign of the Cross at the Lord's Table.*

The next thing, mentioned in the Constitutions, is the use of the sign of the cross, before the minister proceeds to the consecration. And, of this, there is more certain evidence in the ancient writers. For Chrysostom says expressly, "That it was not only used by Christians every day, but particularly at the holy table, and in the ordinations of priests; and that its glory shined with the body of Christ in the mystical supper:" which implies, that it was used more than once in the time of celebration. St. Austin says likewise, "that it was used in all their offices, in consecrating the waters of baptism, in the unction of confirmation, and in the sacrifice of the eucharist; without which none of them were solemnly performed."

SECT. VIII.—*Of the usual Preface, called Sursum Corda, or the Preparation to the great Thanksgiving.*

Next after this, immediately before the great thanksgiving, in the Constitutions, the priest having given the people another salutation, in the words of St. Paul, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c. be with you;" and they answering again, "And with thy spirit;" the priest goes on and says, "Lift up your hearts;" to which the people answer, "We lift them up unto the Lord." The priest says again, "Let us give thanks to the Lord;" and the people answer, "It is meet and right so to do." Now this is mentioned almost by all ecclesiastical writers that have said any thing of the eucharist, or prayer. St. Cyprian^x calls it 'the

^v Chrysostom. Demonstrat. Quod Christus sit Deus, c. ix. tom. v. p. 840, (p. 752, edit. Francof.) "Ὡςπερ ἐν στήλῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ μιστάκου καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν διατυπούμενοι περιφέρουσιν οὗτος ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ τραπέζῃ, οὗτος ἐν ταῖς ἱερῇαι χειροτονίαις, οὗτος πάλιν μετὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ μυστικὸν δῖπνον διαλάμπει."

^w Aug. Hom. cxviii. in Joan. p. 225. Quid est signum Christi, nisi crux Christi? Quod signum nisi adhibeatur, sive frontibus credentium, sive ipsi aquæ ex qua regenerantur, sive oleo quo chrismate unguuntur, sive sacrificio quo aluntur, nihil eorum rite perficitur. (Antwerp. vol. iii. p. 581, B.)

^x Cyprian. de Orat. p. 152, (p. 107, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Sacerdos ante orationem præfatione præmissa, parat fratrum mentes dicendo, 'Sursum corda;' ut dum respondet plebs, 'Habemus ad Dominum,' admoneatur nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere.

preface,' that was premised by the priest, to prepare the brethren's minds to pray with a heavenly temper. St. Austin mentions it above ten times in his writings. The places have been noted above,^a in the general discourse of liturgies; and therefore I need not here repeat them. I will only remark, that he says,^a "It was the custom of the whole Church, throughout the world, to say daily, almost with one voice, 'We lift up our hearts unto the Lord;'" and that, therefore,^a "The hearts of a Christian people were a sort of heaven, because they are daily lift up to heaven, whilst the priest says, 'Lift up your hearts;' and they answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.'" St. Chrysostom also^b frequently mentions the use of this 'preface' in his homilies: which, because I have related at length in a former book, I forbear to repeat them again in this place. The reader that is curious, may find the same forms related in Cyril's Mystical Catechisms,^c and Anastasius Sinaita,^d and Cæsarius Arelatensis,^e and Eligius Noviomensis,^f not to mention the Greek

^a Book xiii. chap. v. sect. vii. See vol. iv. p. 220.

^a Aug. de Vera Relig. c. iii. tom. i. p. 302, (p. 703, edit. Basil. 1569.) Quotidie per universum orbem humanum genus una pene voce respondet, 'Sursum corda se habere ad Dominum.'

^a Aug. Serm. xlv. de Tempore, (tom. x. p. 663, edit. Basil.) Corda fidelium cælum sunt; quia in cælos quotidie eriguntur, dicente sacerdote, 'Sursum corda; securi respondent, 'Habemus ad Dominum.'

^b Chrysost. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. p. 873, (p. 673, edit. Francof.) cit. lib. xiii. vol. iv. 294. Hom. xxii. in Hebr. p. 1898, cit. ibid. Hom. v. de Pœnitent. tom. vi. edit. Savil. Hom. xxxviii. de Pœnitent. et Sacra Eucharistia, p. 569, cit.

^c Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. iii. Μετὰ τοῦτο βοᾷ ὁ ἱερεὺς, "Αὐτὰ τὰς καρδίας . . . ἡμεῖς ἀναγινώσκοντες," Ἐρχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.

^d Anastas. Serm. de Synaxi, Ap. Albertin. de Eucharistia, p. 529. Impleamus mentem, ad cælum adscendamus, sursum levemus animum et corda. Oculos animæ ad Deum extollamus. Transeamus cælum, transeamus angelos. Trans-eamus Cherubim, et ad ipsum Domini thronum accurramus. Ipsos Christi immaculatos pedes apprehendamus: ploremus, et ipsius misericordiam quasi cogamus. Confiteamur in sancto, cœlesti, et intellectuali ipsius altari. Hæc vobis denuntiat, hæc vos obtestatur sacerdos, cum ait, 'Sursum habeamus corda.'

^e Cæsar. Hom. xii. (Bibl. Patr. tom. viii. p. 832.) Cum maxima pars populi, immo quod pejus est, pene omnes, recitatis lectionibus, exeunt de ecclesia, cui dicturus est sacerdos, 'Sursum corda.'

^f Eligius, Hom. xi. de Cœna Domini. Ex verbis Cypriani. (Bibl. Patr. Max. tom. xii. p. 314, edit. Lugd. 1677.) Modum orationis sanctissimus martyr Cyprianus nos docet, dicens. . . . Sacerdos ante orationem, præfatione præmissa, parat fratrum mentes dicendo, 'Sursum corda,' &c.

liturgies, or any later writers. I only observe further, out of the Council of Milevis,⁵ where there is mention made of ‘prefaces’ among other prayers, it is commonly supposed, by learned men, that these forms are meant, “Lift up your hearts;” “We lift them up unto the Lord;” “Let us give thanks unto the Lord;” “It is meet and right so to do.” Which, as Mabillon⁶ observes, in the old Gallican Liturgy, is called *contestatio*, because, by these answers, the people gave in their attestation or testimony of their compliance with the priest’s exhortation, declaring that their hearts were now in heaven, and that it was meet and right to praise the Lord.

SECT. IX.—*Of the Εὐχαριστία, or ‘great Thanksgiving,’ properly so called.*

After this the priest went on with the *εὐχαριστία*, properly so called; that is, the ‘great thanksgiving’ to God for all his mercies, both of creation, providence, and redemption, where a commemoration was made of all that God had done for man, from the foundation of the world, and more particularly in the great mystery of redemption: upon which a solemn and magnificent glorification of God was framed, always including the *trisagion*, or ‘seraphical hymn,’ “Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of hosts,” &c. which was sung by the minister and people jointly; and then the minister went on alone to finish the solemn thanksgiving. We have nowhere else, indeed, so long a thanksgiving as is that in the Constitutions; but the substance of it is not only in the liturgies that go under the names of St. James, Chrysostom, and Basil, but may be discovered in more authentic writings. For Justin Martyr, describing the Christian rites and mysteries, says,¹ “As soon as the common prayers were ended, and they had saluted one another with a kiss, bread, and wine and water, was brought to the president; who, receiving them,

⁵ Conc. Milevit. c. xii. Placuit, ut preces vel orationes et missæ sive ‘præfationes, quæ probatæ fuerint in concilio, ab omnibus celebrentur.’

⁶ Mabillon. de Liturg. Gallic. lib. i. c. iii. n. xvii. p. 24. In his missalibus Gallicanis occurrit primo loco Præfatio. . . . Quinto Contestatio, alias Immolatio missæ, et, ut apud Mozarabes, Inlatio, nobis modo Præfatio, in qua fideles sursum corda se habere contestantur.

¹ Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97. Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἁσπαζόμεθα πανσήμεροι τῶν

gave praise and glory to the Father of all things, by the Son and Holy Spirit, and made *εὐχαριστίαν ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ*, 'a long thanksgiving' for the blessings which he vouchsafed to bestow upon them; and when he had ended the prayers and thanksgiving, all the people that were present answered, with acclamation, 'Amen.'" After the same manner Irenæus:^k "We offer unto him his own gifts, thereby declaring the communication and truth both of flesh and spirit. For as the bread, which is of the earth, after the invocation of God upon it, is no longer common bread, but the eucharist, consisting of two parts, the one earthly, the other heavenly; so all our bodies, receiving the eucharist, are no longer corruptible, whilst they live in hopes of a resurrection. But we offer these things to him, not as if he stood in need of them, but as giving him thanks for his gifts, and sanctifying the creature." So Origen says,^l "They eat the bread that was offered to the Creator, with prayer and thanksgiving for the gifts that he had bestowed on them; which bread was made a holy body by prayer, sanctifying those that used it with a pious mind." Cyril of Jerusalem more particularly specifies the substance of this thanksgiving in his Mystical Catechisms, saying,^m "After this [that is, after we have said, 'Let us give

εὐχῶν· ἵπαιτα προσφέρεται τῷ προστάτῃ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ πρέματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Τίτου καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, ἀναπίμπει· καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιώσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιῆται· οὐ συντελίσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπιυφημεῖ λίγῶν, 'Αμήν'. (Apol. i. p. 83.)

^k Iren. lib. iv. c. xxiv. Offerimus ei, quæ sunt ejus, congruenter communicationem et veritatem prædicantes carnis et spiritus. Quemadmodum enim, qui est a terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et cælesti; sic et corpora nostra, percipientia eucharistiam, jam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia. Offerimus autem ei, non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes donationi ejus, et sanctificantes creaturam.

^l Origen. cont. Cels. lib. viii. p. 399. 'Ημῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντός δημιουργῷ ὑπεριστύντες, καὶ τοὺς μὲν εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθῆσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἰσθίμεν, σῶμα γινόμενους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίον τι καὶ ἁγιάζον τοὺς μετὰ ὑγίους προσέσεις αὐτῷ χρωμένους.

^m Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. v. p. 537. Μετὰ ταῦτα μνημονεύομεν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης· ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ἄστρων, καὶ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως λογικῆς τι καὶ ἀλόγου, ἱερατῆς τι καὶ ἀοράτου, ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, δυνάμεων, κυριοτήτων, ἀρχῶν, ἱεραρχῶν, θρόνων, τῶν Χερουβιμ τῶν τὸ πρόσωπον δυνάμει καλυπτόντων, λίγοντες τὸ τοῦ Δαδὶδ, Μιγαλύναντες τὸν Κύριον σὺν ἡμῶν· μνημονεύομεν νῦν καὶ τῶν

thanks to the Lord,' and 'It is meet and right so to do,'] we make mention of the heaven, and earth, and sea, and the sun, moon, and stars, and all the creatures, rational and irrational, visible and invisible, angels, archangels, hosts and dominions, principalities and powers, thrones and cherubims, covering their faces, saying, with David, 'Magnify the Lord with me.' We also make mention of the cherubims which Esaias saw in the Spirit, standing about the throne of God, and with two wings covering their faces, and with two their feet, and flying with two, and saying, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts.'" This is much the same with the thanksgiving in St. James's Liturgy, which was used in the Church of Jerusalem, in this form :^a "It is very meet and right, becoming us and our duty, that we should praise thee, and celebrate thee with hymns, and give thanks unto thee, the Maker of all creatures, visible and invisible, the 'Treasure of all good, the Fountain of life and immortality, the God and Lord of all things, whom the heavens, and the heavens of heavens praise, and all the host of them; the sun, and moon, and the whole company of stars; the earth and sea, and all that are in them; the celestial congregation of Jerusalem; the Church of the first-born, who are written in heaven; the spirits of just men and prophets; the souls of martyrs and apostles; angels and archangels, thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, the tremendous hosts,

Χιρουβίμ, ἃ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἰδέσθαιτο 'Ἡσαίας παριστηνόντα κύβητ τοῦ Θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῖς μὲν δυσὶ πτέρυξι, κατακαλύπτοντα τὸ πρόσωπον, ταῖς δὲ δυσὶ τοῖς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς δυσὶ πιστόμιναι, καὶ λίγοντα, "Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ.

^a Liturg. Jacobi Bibl. Patr. Gr.-Lat. tom. ii. p. 12. 'Ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔξόν ἴσται καὶ δίκαιον, πρίν τι καὶ ἐφελόμινον, εἰ πινεῖν, εἰ ὑμνεῖν, εἰ ὑλογεῖν, εἰ προσκυνεῖν, εἰ δοξολογεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, τῷ πάσις κτίσις ὁρατῆς τι καὶ ἀοράτου δημιουργῇ, τῷ Θεσαυρῷ τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν, τῇ πηγῇ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς ἀθανασίας, τῷ πάντων Θεῷ καὶ διστότῳ' ὃν ὑμνεῖσιν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν' ἡλίας τι καὶ σιλήνη, καὶ πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἄστρον χορὸς' γῆ, θάλασσα, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς' Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ ἱερουζαλὴμ πανήγυρις, ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων, ἀπογινεσθαιμῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς' πνεύματα δίκαιων καὶ προφητῶν' ψυχὰι μαρτύρων καὶ ἀποστόλων' ἄγγιλοι, ἀρχάγγιλοι, θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἀρχαὶ τι καὶ ἔξουσίαι καὶ δυνάμεις φοβεραὶ, καὶ τὰ Χιρουβίμ πολυύμματα, καὶ τὰ ἔξαπτίγυγα Σεραφίμ, ἃ ταῖς μὲν δυσὶ πτέρυξι κατακαλύπτει τὰ πρόσωπα ἑαυτῶν, ταῖς δὲ δυσὶ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς δυσὶ ἰστίμιναι, κίβραγι ἵτερον πρὸς ἵτερον ἀκαταπαύστοις ἐτόμισιν, ἀειγῆτοις δοξολογίαις.

and cherubims with many eyes, and seraphims with six wings, with two whereof they cover their faces, and with two their feet, and with two they fly, crying out incessantly one to another, and singing with loud voices the triumphal song of the magnificence of thy glory, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.’”

St. Chrysostom also speaks of this thanksgiving, though he does not give us the whole form of it, but only the introduction, saying,^o “The prayer of thanksgiving is common both to priest and people; for not only the priest gives thanks, but all the people: for, first, he receives their answer and attestation, ‘That it is meet and right to praise the Lord,’ and then he begins the thanksgiving. And why should you wonder, that the people should sometimes speak with the priest, when they do, even with the cherubims and celestial powers, send up those sacred hymns to heaven above?” He means those hymns, “Holy, Holy, Holy,” &c., and, “Glory be to God on high;” which, as we shall presently see, were one part of this great thanksgiving.

Among the Latin writers, this previous giving of thanks is mentioned by Fulgentius also, who says,^p “In the Christian sacrifice, there was both a thanksgiving, and a commemoration made of the flesh of Christ, and of his blood, which he shed for our sakes.” And so St. Ambrose, or whoever was the author of the books *De Sacramentis*, among his works; distinguishing between the thanksgiving and the consecration, he asks,^q “With what words, and with whose

^o Chrysostom. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. p. 873. Τὰς τῆς εὐχαριστίας πάλιν κοινὰ, κ. τ. λ.—Vid. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. ix.—Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 739, (p. 516, edit. Francof.) Τὴν τῆς εἰκουμένης καὶ τῶν κοινῶν εὐχαριστοῦμεν ἀγαθόν.

^p Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, c. xix. In isto sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit, et sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit. (P. 495.)

^q Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iv. c. iv. Consecratio quibus verbis est, et cujus sermonibus? Domini Jesu. Nam reliqua omnia quæ dicuntur in superioribus, a sacerdote dicuntur, laudes Deo deferuntur, oratio petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro cæteris: ubi venit ut conficiatur venerabile sacramentum, jam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed sermonibus Christi. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 430.)]

words, is the consecration made?" And answers, "With the words of the Lord Jesus; for all that goes before, is either the glorification and praise of God, or prayer for the people, for kings, and the rest of mankind: but when the priest comes to the consecration of the holy sacrament, then he uses not his own words, but the words of Christ." By all which it is indisputably evident, that the consecration of the sacrament was ushered in with a solemn thanksgiving, or glorification of God, for all his gifts and benefits, whence the whole action had the name of *εὐχαριστία*, the 'eucharist or thanksgiving;' because this was always premised as a necessary part of the sacred mystery; and the whole action and ceremony was concluded with another thanksgiving after communicating, as we shall see hereafter.

SECT. X.—*Of the Use of the Trisagion, or 'Seraphical Hymn,' "Holy, Holy, Holy," in this Thanksgiving.*

At present we are to observe, that one part of this glorification, or thanksgiving, was the hymn, called the *trisagion* and *epinicion*, the 'seraphical and triumphal hymn,' "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory." This is evident from the last-mentioned passages of St. Cyril^r and St. Chrysostom,^s who, in other places, gives a more particular account of the use of it at the Lord's table. "Heretofore," says he,^t "this hymn was only sung in heaven; but, after that the Lord vouchsafed to come down upon earth, he brought this melody to us also: therefore the bishop, when he stands at this holy table to present our rational service, and offer the unbloody sacrifice, does

^r Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. c. v. See note (m), p. 87.

^s Chrysost. Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor. p. 873. See note (o), p. 89.

^t Chrysost. Hom. in Seraphim. tom. iii. p. 890, (p. 772, fin. 773, edit. Francof.)
 Πρώτῳ μὲν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς οὗτος ᾠδεῖτο μόνος ὁ ὕμνος· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐκτεῖναι τῆς γῆς κατεξέτισεν ὁ δισπότης, καὶ τὴν μελωδίαν ταύτην κατήνεγκε πρὸς ἡμᾶς. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ μέγας οὗτος ἀρχιερεὺς, ἐπειδὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης ἱσότην τραπέζης, τὴν λογικὴν ἀναφίξιν λατρείαν, τὴν ἀναιμάκτον προσφέρειν θυσίαν, οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν εὐφημίαν ταύτην καλεῖ, ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὰ Χερουβὶμ εἰπὼν, καὶ τῶν Σεραφὶμ ἀναμνήσας, οὕτω παρακαλιῦνται πάντες ἀνατίμψαι τὴν φρικωδιστάτην φωνὴν, τῇ τῶν συγχωρονόντων μνήμῃ τὴν δάνοιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀνασπῶν, καὶ μονοῦχι βῶν πρὸς ἑαστοὺς ἡμῶν, καὶ λίγων, μιστὰ τῶν Σεραφὶμ ᾄδουσ, μιστὰ τῶν Σεραφὶμ στῆθι, μετ' ἐκείνων τὰς πτέρυγας πύσσουσ, μετ' ἐκείνων περιέπτασσιν τὸν θρόνον τὸν βασιλικόν.

not simply call upon us to join in this glorification, but, first naming the cherubims, and making mention of the seraphims, he then exhorts us all to send up these tremendous words, and withdrawing our minds from the earth, by intimating with what company we make a quire, he cries out to every man, and says, as it were, in these words, ‘Thou singest with the seraphims; stand together with the seraphims, stretch forth thy wings with them, with them fly round the royal throne.’” In another place, shewing the obligation which the eucharist lays upon men to keep every member of the body pure from sin, the hands and mouth that receive it, the eyes that view it, the tongue that ministers in those mysteries, and is dyed in blood, he argues thus particularly with respect to the ears: “How absurd is it, after that mystical hymn, which was brought by the cherubims from heaven, to pollute your ears with songs of harlots, and the effeminate melodies of the theatre?” which plainly implies, that this seraphical hymn was one part of this great thanksgiving. He says the same in his first homily upon Isaiah: “The seraphims above sing the holy *trisagion* hymn; the holy congregation of men on earth send up the same; the general assembly of celestial and earthly creatures join together; there is ‘one thanksgiving,’ μία εὐχαριστία, one exultation, one quire of men and angels in one station rejoicing together.” In another place, reproving those who stayed at the communion-service, when they would not communicate, he tells them,* it was better that they should be absent, for they did but affront him that

* Chrysostom. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. i. p. 266, C. (p. 236, edit. Francof.) Πῶς οὐκ ἄτασιν, μετὰ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐκείνην φωνήν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν φερομένην, (τὴν ἐκ τῶν Χερουβὶμ λίγῳ), πορευομένους ᾄσμασι, καὶ κατακλιπασμένοις μίλιςι τὴν ἀκοὴν μολύνειν;

† Ibid. Hom. in Iesa. tom. iii. p. 834, B. (p. 724, edit. cit.) “Ἄνω τὰ Σεραφίμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ἀναβοᾷ· κάτω τὸν αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναπέμψαι πληθύν· κοινὴ τῶν ἰσχυρανῶν καὶ ἱππικῶν συγκροτεῖται πανήγυρις· μία εὐχαριστία, ἓν ἀγαλλίαμα, μία εὐφρόσυνος χοροστασία.

* Ibid. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1052, (p. 888, edit. cit.) Σὺ παραγίγνας, τὸν ὕμνον ἤσας, μετὰ πάντων ὁμολογήσας εἶναι τῶν ἁγίων, τῷ μὴ μετὰ τῶν ἀναξίων ἀνακλιπασθῆναι; πῶς ἵμεις, καὶ οὐ μετίχμεις τῆς τραπίζης· ἀνάξιός ἐσμι, φησὶν οὐκοῦν καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας ἐκείνης, τῆς ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς· οὐ γὰρ διὰ τῶν προκλιμένων μένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν ᾄδων ἐκείνων τὸ πνεῦμα πάντοθεν κἀκείσιν.

invited them, whilst they stayed to sing the hymn, professing themselves to be of the number of the worthy, whilst they did not recede with the unworthy. "How could you stay, and not partake of the table? I am unworthy, say you. If so, you are unworthy to communicate in prayers also; for it is not only the bare elements, but those hymns that cause the Spirit to descend upon them." Though he does not here name the hymns, he plainly intimates, however, that they were commonly used in this part of the eucharistical service. And elsewhere he speaks more plainly:¹ "The faithful," says he, "know what are the hymns of the powers above; what the cherubims sing in heaven; what the angels sung, 'Glory be to God in the highest;' therefore hymns come after the psalmody, as a thing of greater perfection." He means, that psalmody was only a part of the service of the catechumens; but these hymns were used by the τέλειοι, 'the communicants,' in the service of the altar. He mentions the same in many other places, which the reader may find above,² in the collection of the ancient liturgy out of St. Chrysostom's works. I will only repeat one passage more out of his homily upon the martyrs.³ "The martyrs," says he, "are now joining in consort, and partaking in the mystical songs of the heavenly quire: for if, whilst they were in the body, whenever they communicated in the sacred mysteries, they made part of the quire, singing with the cherubims the *trisagion* hymn, 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' as all ye that are initiated in the holy mysteries, very well know; much more, now, being joined with them, whose partners they were in the earthly quire, they do with greater freedom partake in those solemn blessings and glorifications of God,

¹ Chrysostom. Hom. ix. in Coloss. p. 1380, (p. 221, edit. cit.) Τίς ὁ ὕμνος τῶν ἄνω, τί λίγυ τὰ Χερουβίμ, ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοί· τί ἔλιγον οἱ ἄγγελοι, Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ διὰ τοῦτο μισὰ τὰς ψαλμωδίας ὕμνοι, αἵτε τελειούσιόν τι πρᾶγμα.

² Hom. iv. de Incomprehensibili, tom. i. p. 375, (p. 333, c. edit. Francof.) cit. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. i. p. 267. Hom. xvi. Si esurierit Inimicus, tom. v. p. 229, (p. 208, e. edit. cit.) cit. ibid. sect. v. p. 280. Hom. iii. de Pœnit. tom. iv. p. 562, (p. 493, edit. cit.) cit. ibid. sect. iv. p. 277. Epist. ii. ad Olympiad. tom. iv. p. 715, (p. 625, b. edit. cit.) cit. ibid. Hom. xiv. in Ephes. p. 1127, (p. 981, edit. cit.) ibid. sect. x. p. 296.

³ Chrysostom. Hom. lxxiv. de Martyr. tom. i. p. 900, (p. 796, a. b. edit. Francof.) Vid. Græc. lib. xiii. c. vi. p. 270.

in heaven above." There needs no recourse now, after this, to be had to the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, to prove that this Divine hymn was always a part of the solemn thanksgiving, since it is more solemnly proved out of his genuine writings. To which we may add Severianus of Gabala^b for the Greek Church, and the Council of Vaison for the Latin; which says,^c that "In all communion-services, whether they were morning-services, or *quadragesimal*, or commemorations for the dead, the hymn, 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' should be used in the same order as in the public service."

SECT. XI. — *A particular Thanksgiving for the Mercies of God, in the Redemption of Mankind by Christ.*

Next, after this, there follows, in the Constitutions, a particular enumeration of the mercies of God, vouchsafed to mankind in the redemption of the world by the death of Christ, and a more special thanksgiving with respect to them; wherein also is contained a sort of creed, or summary of the chief articles of the Christian faith, which was all the creed that the Church, in that age, made use of in that service: for as yet the formal repetition of the baptismal creed was no part of the communion-service, as it was in after-ages; but only such doctrines were related as were the subject of a particular thanksgiving, for the great mysteries of the incarnation and redemption. Thus it is represented in the Constitutions, with which St. Chrysostom exactly corresponds; for, commenting on those words of the apostle, "The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" he brings in the apostle, thus explaining himself: "When I speak of a blessing, I unfold all the treasure of God's beneficence, and commemorate all his great and glorious gifts." And he adds,^d "We also, in offering the cup, recite the ineffable mercies and

^b Hom. xxxvii. de Filio Prodigio inter Opera Chrysostom. tom. vi. p. 375, (p. 313, edit. Francof.) cit. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. vi. litt. (^m).

^c Conc. Valens. II. c. iii. Ut in omnibus missis, seu in matutinis, seu in quadragesimalibus, seu in illis, quæ pro defunctorum commemoratione fiunt, semper Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, eo ordine, quo modo ad missas publicas dicitur, dici debeat. (iv. 1680, C. 8.)

^d Chrysostom. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. p. 532, (Paris. 1636, p. 256, edit. Francof.) Εὐλογίαν ἔραν ἵπτω, πάντα ἀναπτύσσω τὸν τῆς δωρεῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ

kindness of God, and all the good things we enjoy, and so we offer it, and communicate: giving him thanks, for that he hath delivered mankind from error; that he hath made us near, who were afar off; that when we were without hope, and without God, in the world, he hath made us the brethren of Christ, and fellow heirs with him: For these, and all the like blessings, we give him thanks, and so come to his holy table." We cannot have a plainer proof of a particular thanksgiving than this is: and, therefore, I shall seek for no further evidence in the case, but proceed to the immediate form of consecration.

SECT. XII.—*The Form of Consecration always composed of a Repetition of the Words of Institution, and Prayer to God, to sanctify the Gifts by his Holy Spirit.*

Now this, anciently, was not a bare repetition of those words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, 'This is my body,' which, for many ages, has been the current doctrine of the Romish schools; but a repetition of the history of the institution, together with prayers to God, that he would send his Holy Spirit upon the gifts, and make them become the body and blood of Christ; not by altering their nature and substance, but their qualities and powers, and exalting them from simple elements of bread and wine, to become types and symbols of Christ's flesh and blood, and efficacious instruments of conveying to worthy receivers all the benefits of his death and passion. Thus it is evidently set forth in the Constitutions, which, for the reader's ease, I will here again repeat: "We, therefore, in commemoration of these things which Christ suffered for us, give thanks to thee, Almighty God, not as thou deservest, and as we ought, but as we are

Θησαυρὸν, καὶ τῶν μεγάλων ἐκείνων ἀναμνησκῶν δωριῶν καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖς ἐπι-
λέγοντες τῇ ποτηρίῃ τὰς ἀφάτους εὐεργισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὅσων ἀπολιταύκαμεν,
οὕτως αὐτὸ προσάγομεν, καὶ κοινωνοῦμεν, εὐχαριστοῦντες, ὅτι τῆς πλάνης ἀπήλλαξε
τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος· ὅτι μακρὰν ὄντας, ἐγγὺς ἐποίησιν· ὅτι ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντας,
καὶ ἀβίους ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ, ἀδελφοὺς ἑαυτοῦ πατισκύνουσι καὶ συγκληρονόμους· ὅτι
τούτων, καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀπάντων εὐχαριστοῦντες, οὕτως πρέσβιμι.—Ita Cyprian.
Ep. cxiii. p. 156, (p. 278, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) *Passionis ejus mentionem in
omnibus sacrificiis facimus.*

* Constitut. lib. viii. c. xii. p. 402. Vid. supra, sect. i. sub litt. (b).

able, so fulfilling his command ; for he, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread in his holy and immaculate hands ; and looking up to thee, his God and Father, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, ‘ This is the mystery of the New Testament ; take of it, and eat it ; this is my body, which is broken for many, for the remission of sins. This do in remembrance of me ; for as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew forth my death till I come.’ We, therefore, being mindful of his passion, and death, and resurrection from the dead, and his return into heaven ; and also of his second coming, when he shall return with glory and power to judge the quick and dead, and render to every man according to his works, do offer unto thee, our King and God, this bread and this cup, according to his appointment ; giving thanks to thee by him, for that thou dost vouchsafe to let us stand before thee, and minister unto thee ; and we beseech thee to look propitiously upon these gifts, here set before thee, and to accept them favourably, to the honour of thy Christ, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the Spirit that is witness of the suffering of the Lord Jesus, that it may make this bread become the body of thy Christ ; that they, who partake of it, may be confirmed in godliness, and obtain remission of sins ; may be delivered from the devil, and his impostures ; may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and be made worthy of Christ, and obtain eternal life, thou being reconciled to them, O Lord Almighty.”

Who sees not, that the consecration, in this form, is made by a repetition of the history of the institution, and prayer for the coming of the Holy Ghost on the elements to sanctify them ? and for this there is the concurrent testimony of all antiquity. Justin Martyr^f makes the consecration to consist in thanksgiving and prayers ; which being ended, all the people answer, “ Amen.” Irenæus says, more expressly, that it is done by invocation of God,^g “ For the bread, which is taken from the earth, has the invocation of

^f Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97, cit. supra, sect. ix. sub litt. (i), pp. 86, 87.

^g Iren. lib. iv. c. xxxiv. Qui est e terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed eucharistia.

God upon it, and then it is no longer common bread, but the eucharist." Origen says,^b "It is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." Cyril of Jerusalem tells his catechumens,ⁱ "That before the invocation of the Holy Trinity the bread and wine of the eucharist is common bread and wine; but, after the invocation, it is no longer bare bread, but the body of Christ: as the holy oil is not bare oil after the invocation, but the gift of Christ." So, again,^k "After we have sanctified ourselves by those spiritual hymns, we then pray the merciful God, that he would send forth his Holy Spirit upon the elements lying upon the altar, that he may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ;" which manifestly declares, that the consecration was made by prayer and invocation. And the same is implied by St. Basil, when he asks,^l "Which of the saints hath left us, in writing, the words of the invocation, by which the bread of the eucharist, and the cup of blessing, is consecrated?" Gregory Nyssen, St. Basil's brother, says,^m "The bread is sanctified by the word of God, and prayer." Theophilus of Alexandria,ⁿ "That the bread and wine, which represent the Lord's body and blood upon the table, are consecrated by invocation, and coming of the Holy Ghost upon them." And Theodoret most plainly, in one of his

^b Origen. in Matth. xv. tom. ii. p. 27, (p. 17, a. edit. Paris. 1604.) Sanctificatur per verbum Dei, perque obsecrationem.

ⁱ Cyril. Catech. Mystag. iii. n. iii. Μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ. (Paris. 1609, p. 525.)

^k Ibid. v. n. v. 'Αγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλόνητον Θεόν, τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἕξαποστείλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προσέμνητα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ, τὸν μὲν ἄρτον, σῶμα Χριστοῦ τὸν δὲ οἶνον, αἷμα Χριστοῦ. (P. 538.)

^l Basil. de Spirit. Sanct. c. xxvii. Τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδύσει τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τῆς εὐλογίας, τίς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν καταλείπειν; (P. 210, D. 6.)

^m Nyssen. Orat. Catech. c. xxxvii. (tom. iii. p. 104, c.) Ὁ ἄρτος . . . ἀγιάζεται διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως.

ⁿ Theophil. Ep. Paschal. i. (Bibl. Patr. Max. tom. v. p. 846, e. edit. Lugd. 1677.) Dicit Spiritum Sanctum non operari ea, quæ in anima sunt, nec ad irrationabilia pervenire. Quod adserens non recogitat, aquas in baptisinate mysticas adventu Sancti Spiritus consecrari, panemque Dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur, et quem frangimus in sanctificatione nostrâ, et sacrum calicem, quum in mensa ecclesiæ collocantur, et utique inanima sunt, per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus sanctificari.

dialogues,^o “What do you call the gift that is offered before the priest has made the invocation over it? ‘Bread, made of such seeds.’ What do you call it after sanctification? ‘The body of Christ.’” The Latin fathers are as plain in their verdict. St. Ambrose says,^p “The sacraments which we take, are transformed into flesh and blood by the mystery of holy prayer.” And Optatus, describing the fury of the Donatists, asserts the same, when he asks them,^q “What greater sacrilege they could be guilty of, than to pull down the altars of God, where God Almighty was invoked, and the Holy Spirit came down at the supplication of the priest?” St. Jerom says,^r “It was the peculiar office of the presbyters to consecrate the body and blood of Christ by prayer;” and, again, that^s “prayer was necessary for this purpose.” The author of the books *De Sacramentis*, under the name of St. Ambrose, gives us the very form of words used in this prayer: ^t “Make this, our oblation, a chosen, rational, acceptable oblation, which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Juvencus says,^u “Christ himself consecrated it by prayer.” And Gregory the Great was of

^o Theodoret, Dial. ii. (tom. iv. pp. 84, 85.) *Τί καλῶς τὸ προσφερόμενον δῶρον πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως; . . . τὴν ἐκ τοιῶνδε σπειμάτων τρεφὴν* . . . *Μιστὰ δὲ γὰρ τὸν ἀγιασμένον πῶς ταῦτα προσαναγορεύεις; σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.*

^p Ambros. de Fide, lib. iv. c. v. Quotiescumque sacramenta sumimus, quæ per sacræ orationis mysterium in carnem transfigurantur et sanguinem, mortem Domini adnuntiamus.

^q Optat. lib. vi. p. 93, (p. 111, edit. Paris. 1679.) Quod est tam sacrilegum, quam altaria Dei (in quibus et vos aliquando obtulistis) frangere, radere, removere? in quibus vota populi, et membra Christi portata sunt: quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit: quo postulatus descendit Spiritus Sanctus.

^r Hieron. Epist. lxxv. ad Evagrium. Ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur.

^s Ibid. Comment. in Zephan. c. iii. p. 98. *Εὐχαριστίαν* imprecantis *facere verba*, &c.

^t Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iv. c. v. Vis scire quia verbis cœlestibus consecratur? accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos, ‘Fac nobis,’ inquit, ‘hanc oblationem ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.’ (Vol. iv. p. 130.)

^u Juvenc. Hist. Evangel. lib. iv. Bibl. Patr. tom. viii. p. 654, (p. 74, h. edit. Lugd. 1677.)

. . . . Palmis sibi frangere panem,
Divisumque dehinc tradit, sancteque precatus,
Discipulos docuit proprium se tradere corpus.

opinion,* that the apostles used only the Lord's Prayer as the form of their consecration. And Cyprian,[†] probably, was of the same opinion; for he thinks that petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," may be understood both in a spiritual and common sense, to denote the body of Christ, which is our bread, that we pray may be given us every day. A great many other fathers speak of the benediction,[‡] or thanksgiving, as that which consecrates the eucharist. Which is not much different from this: for the thanksgiving was always a part of the eucharistical prayers; and, therefore, some join them both together, as Justin Martyr and Irenæus, in the places now mentioned. And so Origen tells Celsus, that[§] "By thanksgiving and prayer they made bread a holy body, sanctifying such as received and ate it with a pure mind." And St. Austin,^{||} who, in some places, calls it barely the 'benediction' or 'thanksgiving,' in other places says, more expressly, that the eu-

* Gregor. Magn. lib. vii. ep. lxxiii. Orationem Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent.

† Cyprian. de Orat. p. 146, (p. 104, edit. Amstelod.) Quod potest et spiritualiter et simpliciter intelligi . . . quia Christus noster panis est. Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus.

‡ Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. i. c. xxiii. p. 377, C. 5. Si ita est, an partem impudentiorem, quam qui . . . super alienum panem alii Deo gratiarum actionibus fungitur? — Clement. Alex. Pædag. lib. ii. c. ii. p. 186. Ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθῆναι, ἀπιδύκει πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων, Οὐ μὴ πῖον ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, κ. τ. λ. — Chrysostom. Hom. lxxxii. in Matth. in Græc. (p. 861, edit. Francof.) Εὐχαριστοῦ, διδάσκων ἡμᾶς, ὅπως διὰ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο ἐπιτελεῖται. — Victor. Antioch. in Marc. xiv. (citante Albertino de Euchar. p. 21.) Conveniebat, ut illi, qui panem proponerent, censerent, post gratiarum actionem esse ipsius corpus. — Facund. Hermianensis Defens. Trium Capitulorum, lib. ix. Dominus benedictum panem et calicem, quem discipulis suis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit. — Cyril. Alex. in Glaphyris super Genes. Exod. et Levitic. styles it 'eulogia,' which is the same as eucharist, or benediction. — Vid. Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. vi. p. 21.

§ Origen. cont. Celsum, lib. viii. p. 399. Ἡμεῖς τῇ τοῦ παντός δημιουργῇ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθείσι προσηγομίους ἄρτους ἐσθίωμεν, σῶμα γινόμενους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἁγίον τι καὶ ἁγιάζον τοὺς μετὰ ὑγιῶς προθέτως αὐτῇ χρωμένους.

|| Aug. Epist. lix. ad Paulinum. Precationes accipimus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione sacramentorum, antequam illud, quod est in mensa Domini, incipiat benedici: orationes, quum benedicatur, et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminuitur. (P. 386, C. 8.)

charist was consecrated by prayer :^c “ We call that the body of Christ, which is taken from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by mystical prayer in a solemn manner, and so received by us unto salvation, in memory of our Lord’s suffering for us.” And, writing against the Donatists, who denied the validity of the sacraments when they were consecrated and administered by sinners, he asks them,^d “ How then does God hear a murderer, when he prays either over the water of baptism, or the oil for unction, or over the eucharist, or over the heads of those that receive imposition of hands ?” Implying, that the consecration of the eucharist, as well as the rest of the things mentioned, was performed by prayer.

To this mighty cloud of witnesses, the Romanists have nothing material to oppose, but a few mistaken passages of the ancients, which the reader may find related, with proper answers, in that excellent book of Albertine, upon the eucharist.* I shall only take notice of one, which carries the fairest pretence, out of Chrysostom, who, in one of his homilies, speaks of the consecration after this manner :^f “ It is not man that makes the elements become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, that was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling his office, and speaking those words ; but the power and grace is of God. Christ said, ‘ This is my body : ’ this word consecrates the elements. And

^c Aug. de Trinitate, lib. iii. c. iv. Corpus Christi dicimus illud, quod ex frugibus terræ acceptum, et mystica prece consecratum rite, sumimus ad spiritalem salutem, in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis.

^d Ibid. de Baptismo, lib. v. c. xx. (ix. p. 104, D.) Quomodo ergo exaudiat Deus homicidam deprecantem, vel super aquam baptismi, vel super oleum, vel super eucharistiam, vel super capita eorum, quibus manus imponitur ?

^e Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. vii. pp. 30–34.

^f Chrysostom. Hom. xxx. de Proditione Judæ, tom. v. p. 463, (hom. xxxii. tom. v. p. 415, edit. Francof.) Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνθρώπος ἐστίν, ὁ ποιεῖν τὰ προκείμενα γίνεσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ· ἀλλ’ αὐτός ἐ σταυρωθείς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστός· σχῆμα πληρῶν ἰσότητων ὁ ἱερεὺς, τὰ ῥήματα φθιγγόμενος ἐκείνα· ἡ δὲ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ· Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, φησὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ῥῆμα μεταβιβάζει τὰ προκείμενα· καὶ καθάπερ ἡ φωνὴ ἐκείνη ἡ λίγυσα, Αὐξάνουθε, καὶ πληθύνεσθε, καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν, ἐβρίθη μὲν ἄπαξ, διὰ παντός δὲ τοῦ χρόνου γίνεται ἔργον ἰδυναμῶσα τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμιτέραν πρὸς παιδοποιῶσαν οὕτω καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη ἄπαξ λιχθίσα καθ’ ἐκαστην τρέπτειν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, ἐξ ἐκείνου μίχρι σήμερον, καὶ μίχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, τὴν θυσίαν ἀπαρητισμένην ἐργάζεται.

as that word, which said, 'Increase, and multiply, and replenish the earth,' was spoken but once, yet at all times is effectual in deed to strengthen our nature to beget children ; so this word once spoken, from that time to this day, and until his coming again, perfects and consummates the sacrifice on every table throughout the Churches." The meaning of which is not as the Romanists mistake, that the pronouncing of these words by the priest, is the thing that makes the sacrifice ; but that Christ, by first speaking those words, gave power unto men to make his symbolical body ; as by once speaking those words, "Increase and multiply," he gave them power to procreate children. Christ's words are the original cause of the consecration ; but still prayer, and not the bare repetition of his words, is the instrumental cause and means of the sanctification. As Chrysostom himself says plainly in another place,^s where he attributes the consecration of the elements to the invocation of the Spirit, and the Spirit's descent pursuant to such invocation. "What meanest thou, O man ?" says he, "When the priest stands by the holy table, lifting up his hands to heaven, and invocating the Holy Spirit, to come down and touch the elements, there should then be great tranquillity and silence. When the Spirit grants his grace, when he comes down, when he touches the elements, when thou seest the lamb slain and offered ; dost thou then raise a tumult and commotion, and give way to strife and railing ?" In which words, it is plain, Chrysostom attributes the consecration to the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit, as the principal and efficient cause ; to prayer and supplication, as the instrumental cause, operating, by way of condition and means, to sanctify the elements, according to Christ's command, by a solemn benediction ; and to the words, "This is my body, and this is my blood," as spoken by Christ in the first institution, implying

^s Chrysostom. Hom. xxxii. in Cœmeterii Appellationem, tom. v. p. 487, (hom. xxxiv. p. 436, edit. Francof.) Τί ποιῇς, ἄνθρωπε ; ὅταν ἐστῇ ὑπὸ τῆς τραπέζης ὁ ἱερεὺς, τὰς χεῖρας ἀνασείνων εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καλῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τοῦ παραγινώσθαι καὶ ἁψασθαι τῶν προκειμένων, πολλὴ ἡσυχία, πολλὴ εὐχὴ ὅταν διδῷ τὴν χάριν τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅταν πατίλῃ, ὅταν ἁψῇ τῶν προκειμένων, ὅταν ἴδῃ τὸ πρόβατον ἱσθαγιασμένον καὶ ἀπηρετισμένον, τότε θόρυβος, τότε ταραχὴ, τότε φιλονικίαν, τότε λοιδορίαν ἰσχυράν ;

a declaration of what was then done, and what should be done, by his power and concurrence, to the end of the world. So that in all things relating to the consecration, we find the practice of the ancients exactly corresponding and agreeing to the order prescribed in the Constitutions. And whereas the author of the Constitutions makes it a very great part of the consecration-prayer, that they who partake of the eucharist, may be confirmed in godliness, and obtain remission of sins, may be delivered from the devil and his impostures, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and be made worthy of Christ, and obtain eternal life; St. Chrysostom evidently refers to such a prayer, when he says,^b “In the oblation, we offer up our sins, and say, ‘Pardon us whatever sins we have committed, either willingly or unwillingly.’ We first make mention of them, and then ask pardon for them.” And so it is in the liturgy which goes under St. Chrysostom’s name :^c “We offer unto thee this rational and unbloody service, beseeching thee to send thy Holy Spirit upon us and these gifts; make the bread the precious body of thy Christ, and that which is in the cup, the precious blood of thy Christ; transmuting them, by thy Holy Spirit, that they may be to the receivers for the washing of their souls, for pardon of sins, for participation of the Holy Ghost, for obtaining the kingdom of heaven, for boldness towards thee, and not for judgment and condemnation.”

^b Chrysostom. Hom. xvii. in Hebr. p. 1870, (p. 644, edit. Francof.) “Ὡςτις ἐπὶ τῆς προσφορῆς, ἀναφέρομεν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, καὶ λίσσομεν, ἵνα ἰκόντες εἴτε ἔμποντες ἡμάρτεμεν, συγχώρησεν, ταυτίσται, μιμηθεὶς αὐτῶν πρῶτον, καὶ τότε τὴν συγχώρησιν αἰτοῦμεν.

^c Ibid. Liturg. tom. iv. p. 614, (p. 540, edit. cit.) Σὺ προσφέρομεν τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην λατρίαν, καὶ ἀναίμακτον, καὶ διόμισθα, καὶ ἱκετεύομεν, κατὰ-πιμψον τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προσκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα· καὶ ποιήσας τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου τὸ δι’ ἐν ποτηρίῳ, τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ· ὥςτις γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς νῆψιν ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄφθισιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, εἰς βασιλείας οὐρανῶν πλήρωμα, εἰς παρρησίαν τὴν πρὸς σε, καὶ μὴ εἰς φόβον ἢ εἰς κατὰκριμα. — Ibid. p. 619, (p. 544.) Συγχώρησόν μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ τὰ παραπτώματά μου τὰ ἰκονία τε καὶ ἀκούσια, εἴτε ἐν γνώσει, εἴτε ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ, εἴτε ἐν λόγῳ, εἴτε ἐν ἔργῳ, εἴτε ἐν ἐπιθυμίῃ ἡπαρξα, πάντα μοι συγχώρησεν, κ. τ. λ.

SECT. XIII. — *After this followed Prayer for the whole Catholic Church.*

Immediately after the consecration, followed prayer for the whole Catholic Church, as redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, which was then commemorated in the oblation and sacrifice of the altar. Thus it is represented in the Constitutions, and thus also in St. Chrysostom, who, speaking of Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, says,^k “He had the care of the whole Church upon him; which he learned to be his duty, from the prayers of the Church. For if prayers ought to be made for the Catholic Church, from one end of the earth to the other, much more did he think it his duty to shew his concern for the whole Church, and watch for their preservation.” In another place, he says,^l “The priest, when the sacrifice was offered, bid the people to pray, or give thanks rather, for the whole world, for those that were absent, and those that were present; for those that were before them, and those that were then living, and for those that should be after them.” And, again,^m he speaks of prayer for the world, the Church, and the common peace and tranquillity of mankind. He says,ⁿ “The priest prayed at the altar, in the time of oblation, for the whole city; and not for the whole city only, but for the whole world.” So Cyril

^k Chrysostom. Hom. lii. in Eustath. tom. i. p. 649, (p. 573, edit. Francof.) Καὶ ἦν πισταδιωμένος καλῶς παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος, ὅτι τὸν ἐκκλησίᾳς προϊσταῖτα οὐκ ἐκείνης μόνης κηδεσθαι διὰ τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἰσχυρισθείσης αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην κειμένης· καὶ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν ἰμάνθαι ἐυχῶν· εἰ γὰρ τὰς ἐυχὰς ποιῆσθαι δεῖ, φησιν, ὑπὲρ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀπὸ περάτων ἰσὺς περάτων τῆς οἰκουμένης, πολλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν ὑπὲρ ἀπάσης αὐτῆς ἐκτείνεσθαι δεῖ, καὶ ὁμοίως ἀπασῶν κηδεσθαι, καὶ μεριμνῆν πάσας.

^l Ibid. Hom. xxvi. in Matth. p. 259, (p. 315, edit. cit.) Ὁ ἱερεὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὑπὲρ τῶν προτέρων, ὑπὲρ τῶν νῦν, ὑπὲρ τῶν γινησθέντων τῶν ἔμμεσθαι, ὑπὲρ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἰσμενίων εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἐυχαιριστιῶν κελύει.

^m Ibid. Hom. xxxvii. in Act. p. 329, (ibid.) Ἀναγκαῖαι αἱ ἐυχὰς ἐνταῦθα γίνονται ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐπὶ περάτων, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐιρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν συμφοραῖς.

ⁿ Ibid. de Sacerdot. lib. vi. c. iv. tom. iv. p. 93, (p. 81, edit. cit.) Τὸν ὑπὲρ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως· καὶ τί λίγω πόλεις; πάσης μὲν οὖν τῆς οἰκουμένης περισσεύοντα, καὶ διόμνον, ταῖς ἀπάντων ἀμαρτίαις ἴλιον γινέσθαι τὸν Θεὸν . . . ἐποῶν τινα εἶναι χρεῖ;

of Jerusalem says,^o “As soon as the spiritual sacrifice was offered, they besought God for the common peace of the Church, and the tranquillity of the world,” &c. And Vigilius,^p in a letter to Justinian, reminds him, how it was customary, from ancient tradition, for all bishops, in offering the sacrifice, to beseech God to unite all men in the Catholic faith, and to protect and keep it throughout the world. Nay, Optatus says,^q the Donatists continued to use this prayer in the celebration of the sacramental mysteries, though their doctrine and practice were the absolute reverse of it. They said, they offered for the Church, which was one, diffused over all the world. But their practice gave their prayers the lie: for they divided it into two, and confined the true Church to a corner of Afric, and the party of Donatus. However this shews, it was the practice both of Donatists and Catholics to pray for the universal Church.

SECT. XIV.—*More particularly for the Bishops and Clergy.*

More particularly, they now repeated their prayers again for the bishops and clergy of the whole Catholic Church, and that Church especially whereof they were members. Which is not only noted in the Constitutions, but by Epiphanius, in his letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem,^r where he wipes off a

^o Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. vi. Μισὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρίαν ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας κυίνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ, παρακαλούμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοιῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐιρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου εὐσταθείας, κ. τ. λ. (538.)

^p Vigil. Epist. iv. ad Justinian. Imperator. Conc. tom. v. p. 315. C. Omnes pontifices, antiqua in offerendo sacrificia traditione, deposcimus, exorantes ut Catholicam fidem adunare, regere Dominus et custodire toto orbe dignetur.

^q Optat. lib. ii. p. 53, (p. 45, edit. Paris. 1679.) Quis dubitet vos illud legitimum in sacramentorum mysterio præterire non posse? offerre vos Deo dicitis pro ecclesia, quæ una est: hoc ipsum mendacii pars est, unam te vocare, de qua feceris duas. Et offerre vos dicitis pro una ecclesia, quæ sit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa. &c.

^r Epiphanius. Epist. ad Joan. Hieros. p. 313. C. Dixerunt, quod in oratione, quando offerimus sacrificia Deo, solemus pro te dicere, ‘Domine, præsta Joanni, ut recte credat.’ Noli nos in tantum putare rusticos, ut hoc tam aperte dicere poterimus. Quamquam enim hoc in corde meo semper orem, tamen (ut simpliciter fatear) numquam in alienas aures protuli, ne te viderer parvi pendere, dilectissime. Quando autem complemus orationem secundum ritum mysteriorum, et pro omni-

slander, which some had falsely suggested to the bishop of Jerusalem, as if he had prayed publicly, that God would grant him an orthodox faith, implying that he was in error : which he denies, telling them, "That however he might pray for him after that manner privately in his heart, yet he never did so in the oblation of the sacrifice : for in offering those prayers, according to the order of the holy mysteries, they were used to say both for him and all other bishops, 'Keep him, O Lord, that preacheth the truth : ' or else after this manner : 'Preserve him, O Lord, and grant that he may preach the truth ;' according as the occasion and order of prayer required." St. Chrysostom also takes notice of this solemn praying for bishops and the clergy, and, among many other particulars, when the oblation was offered. "Some," says he,^s "are so inconsiderate, dissolute, and vain, as to stand and talk, not only in the time of the catechumens," [that is, when prayers were made for them in the first service], "but also at the time of the faithful" [or when their prayers were offered at the altar]. "And this," says he, "is the subversion and ruin of all religion, that, at that time, when men ought chiefly to render God propitious to them, they go away provoking his wrath against them. For, in the prayers of the faithful, we are commanded to supplicate the merciful God for bishops, for presbyters, for kings, for all that are in authority ; for the earth and sea ; for the temperature of the air, or good weather ; and for the whole world. When, therefore, we, who ought to have so much boldness and freedom as to pray for others, are not

bus et pro te quoque dicimus, 'Custodi illum, qui prædicat veritatem.' Vel certe ita : 'Tu præsta, Domine, et custodi, ut ille verbum prædicet veritatis,' sicut occasio sermonis se tulerit, et habuerit oratio consequentiam.

* Chrysostom. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 745, (p. 521, edit. Francof.) 'Ἀλλὰ τινες οὕτως εἰσὶν ἀνόητοι, καὶ βλάκεις, καὶ διαλειμμένοι, ὥς μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν κατηχουμένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν πιστῶν ἵσταναι καὶ διαλίγισθαι ἐντιϋθιν πάντα δίστραπται, ἐντιϋθιν πάντα ἀπόλωλιν· ὅτι ἐν τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν ᾧ μέλλιστα δι' τὸν Θεὸν καταλλάττειν, ἐν τούτῳ παρεξύνοντες ἄπιμιν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν πιστῶν, ὑπὲρ ἐπισκόπων, ὑπὲρ πρεσβυτέρων, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων, ὑπὲρ τῶν κρατούντων, ὑπὲρ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, ὑπὲρ αἵρων, ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης κλιευόμεθα, προσίναμι τῷ φιλανθρωπῷ Θεῷ· ὅταν οὖν οἱ τοσαύτην ἐφειλούντις ἔχουσιν παρρησίαν, ὥς ὑπὲρ ἀλλοτρίων δίσσθαι, μὴδὲ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν νῆφοντες προσιυχόμεθα, τίς ἡμῖν ἡ ἀπολογία ; ποίᾳ συγγνώμῃ ;

vigilant enough to pray for ourselves with an attentive mind; what excuse can we make? what pardon can we expect?" We cannot desire a plainer evidence than this of Chrysostom, that all these things were the subject-matter of their petitions, when the oblation was made upon the altar.

SECT. XV. — *For Kings and Magistrates.*

And, therefore, hence it appears, that as they prayed for the bishops and the clergy, so they repeated their supplication for kings and magistrates, in this prayer also. I have noted before^t the several authors that take notice of their praying for kings in the prayers before the oblation; and here I will subjoin such as mention it in the oblation-prayer. Eusebius, describing the dedication of the church which Constantine built at Jerusalem, says,^u "Some of the bishops then present made panegyric orations upon Constantine's great respect for the common Saviour, and the magnificence of his temple; others preached upon points of divinity proper to the occasion; others explained the mystical sense of Scripture; and others, who could not attain to this, celebrated the mystical service, and offered the unbloody sacrifice to God, making prayers for the common peace of the world, for the Church of God, for the emperor himself, the founder of the church, and for his pious children." In like manner, Cyril of Jerusalem, describing the order of the communion-service, says,^v "After the spiritual sacrifice, and the unbloody service of the propitiatory oblation is completed, we beseech God for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies, for their

^t Book xiii. chap. x. sect. v. Book xv. chap. i. sect. iii.

^u Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. xlv. (Cant. 651, 30.) Οἱ τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργοὶ ὑπαῖς ἄρα καὶ διαλίξαι τὴν ἱερτὴν κατικόμενον· οἱ μὲν τοῦ Διοφίλου βασιλέως τὴν εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων σωτῆρα διζώσιν ἀνυμνοῦντες, τὰς τε περὶ τὸ μαρτύριον μισθολογίας διεξόντες τῇ λόγῳ· οἱ δὲ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων δογμάτων πανηγυρικαῖς Διολογίαις, παιδαισίαν λογικῶν τροφῶν ταῖς πάντων παραδιδόντες ἀποαῖς· ἄλλοι δὲ ἱερηνίας τῶν θείων ἀναγνωσμάτων ποιῶντο, τὰς ἀπορήτους ἀποκαλύπτοντες Διωρίας· οἱ δὲ μὴ διὰ τούτων χωρεῖν οἰοί τε, θυσίαις ἀναίμοις καὶ μυστικαῖς ἱερουργίαις τὸ θεῖον ἰλάσκοντο, ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς εἰρήνης· ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ· αὐτοῦ τε βασιλείας, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τ. σούτων αἰτίου, παίδων τ' αὐτοῦ Διοφίλων, ἱππιστηρίους ὑπαῖς τῇ Θεῷ προσαναφέροντες.

^v Cyril. Catech. Myst. v. n. vi. See note (°), p. 103.

allies, for those that are sick and afflicted ; and, in short, for all that stand in need of help and assistance." St. Chrysostom elsewhere mentions both private and public prayers for kings ;* the latter of which may be understood of these prayers after the oblation, as well as any others. Arnobius says expressly,† "They prayed at once for the magistrates, for their armies, for kings, for their friends, and for their enemies, for the living, and for the dead." Where his mentioning the dead plainly shews, that he speaks of those prayers which were made after the eucharist was consecrated ; in which, as we shall see by and by, a particular commemoration was made of all those that were departed in the faith.

SECT. XVI. — *For the Dead in general.*

Next after prayer for kings, followed prayer for the dead ; that is, for all that were departed in the true faith in Christ. For so it is in the Constitutions : "We offer unto thee, for all thy saints, that have lived well-pleasing in thy sight from the foundation of the world, for patriarchs, prophets, holy men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and all whose names thou knowest." And that this was the general practice of the Church, to pray for all without exception, appears from the concurrent testimony of all the writers of the Church. We have heard Arnobius† say already, that they prayed for the living and the dead in general. And long before him, Tertullian speaks of oblations for the dead,‡ for their birth-days, that is, the day of their death, or a new birth unto happiness, in their annual com-

* Chrysostom. Hom. xx. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. i. p. 258, (p. 230, edit. Francof.) Τὸ δὲ πάντας ἱερατὰς καταστῆσαι, καὶ μὴτ' εὐνοίας πρὶς αὐτοὺς διακρίσθαι περὶ τὴν βασιλίαν τὴν σὴν, καὶ μὴ μόνον κοινὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδίαις ὑπὲρ τῆς σῆς ἀρχῆς ποιῆσθαι εὐχὰς, δυσκατέργατον, κ. τ. λ.

† Arnob. lib. iv. p. 181. Cur immaniter conventicula nostra dirui meruerunt ? In quibus summus oratur Deus, pax cunctis et venia postulatur magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, adhuc vitam degentibus et resolutis corporum vinctione.

‡ Ibid. lib. iv. See preceding note.

§ Tertul. de Corona Mil. c. iii. (p. 102, A. 8.) Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus.

memorations. He says,^a "Every woman prayed for the soul of her deceased husband, desiring that he might find rest and refreshment at present, and a part in the first resurrection, and offering an annual oblation for him on the day of his death." In like manner,^b he says the husband prayed for the soul of his wife, and offered annual oblations for her. St. Cyprian often mentions the same practice, both when he speaks of martyrs and others. For the martyrs, they offered the oblation of prayer, and of praise, and thanksgiving; for others, prayers chiefly. Those for the martyrs he calls^c 'oblations' and 'sacrifices of commemoration;' which they offered especially on the anniversary-days of their martyrdom,^d giving God thanks for their victory and coronation. But for others they made solemn supplications and prayers, as appears from what he says of one Geminus Victor,^e that, because he had appointed a presbyter to be his executor, contrary to law, no oblation should be made for his rest or sleep: nor any deprecation be used in his name according to custom in the Church. The author, under the name of Origen upon Job, says,^f "They made devout mention of the saints, and their parents, and friends, that were dead in the faith; as well to rejoice in their refreshment, as to desire for themselves a pious consummation in the faith." And Origen himself says,^g "They thought it convenient to make mention

^a Tertul. de Monogamia, c. x. (p. 531, A.) Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus.

^b Ibid. Exhortat. ad Castit. c. xi. Jam repete apud Deum, pro cujus spiritu postules, pro qua oblatione annuus reddas.

^c Cyprian. Epist. xxxvii. al. xxii. ad Clerum, p. 28. Celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum.

^d Ibid. Epist. xxxiv. al. xxxix. p. 77. Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meminitis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus.

^e Ibid. Epist. lxvi. al. i. p. 3. Non est, quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in ecclesia frequentetur.

^f Origen. in Job, lib. iii. tom. i. p. 437, edit. Basil. 1571, (p. 491, edit. Basil. 1557.) Et memorias sanctorum facimus, et parentum nostrorum, vel amicorum in fide morientium devote memoriam agimus, tam illorum refrigerio gaudentes, quam etiam nobis piam consummationem in fide postulantes.

^g Ibid. lib. ix. in Rom. xii. tom. ii. p. 607. Meminisse sanctorum, sive in collectis solemnibus, sive pro eo, ut ex recordatione eorum proficiamus, aptum et conveniens videtur.

of the saints in their prayers, and to excite themselves by the remembrance of them." Cyril of Jerusalem, in describing the prayer after consecration, says,^b "We offer this sacrifice in memory of all those that are fallen asleep before us; first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God, by their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications; and then we pray for our holy fathers and bishops, and all that are fallen asleep before us, believing it to be a considerable advantage to their souls to be prayed for, whilst the holy and tremendous sacrifice lies upon the altar." Epiphanius disputes at large against the Arians, who ridiculed all prayers for the dead. For they said, "If the prayers of the living will advantage the dead, then it was no matter for being pious or virtuous; a man only needed to get his friends to pray for him after death, and he would be liable to no punishment; nor would his most enormous crimes be required of him." To whom Epiphanius replies,ⁱ "That they had many good reasons for mentioning the names of the dead; because it was an argument that they were still in being, and living with the Lord; because it was some advan-

^b Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. vi. (p. 538, 18.) Εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκοιμημένων, πρῶτον πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅσους ὁ Θεὸς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ περισδείαις προσδίξεται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν· ἵστα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν προκοιμημένων ἁγίων πατέρων, καὶ ἐπισκόπων, καὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκοιμημένων, μεγίστην ὄνησιν πιστεύοντες ἴσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδιστάτης προκοιμνῆς θυσίας.

ⁱ Epiphanius. Hæres. lxxv. Arian. n. iii. (vol. i. p. 908, A. 9), Objectio Arianorum: Εἰ δὲ ὅλως εὐχὴ τῶν ἐνταῦθα τοὺς ἐκείνους ἄνησιν, ἄρα γοῶν μηδὲς εὐσεβείτω, μηδὲ ἀγαθοποιεῖτω, ἀλλὰ κτησάσθω φίλους τινὰς, δι' οὓς βούλεται τρέπου, ἥτοι χρήμασι πείσας, ἥτοι φίλους ἀξιώσας ἐν τῇ τιλιντῇ, καὶ εὐχίσθωσαν περὶ αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ τι ἐκὶ πάθῃ, μηδὲ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενα τῶν ἀνηκίστων ἀμαρτημάτων ἐκζητηθῇ.—Num. vii. (p. 911, A.) Responsio Epiphani: "Ἐστίνα δὲ περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος λέγειν τῶν τιλιντησάντων, τί ἂν εἴη τοῦτου προουργιαιότερον; τί τοῦτου καιριώτερον καὶ θαυμασιώτερον, πιστεύειν μὲν τοὺς παρόντας, ὅτι οἱ ἀπειθόντες ζῶσι, καὶ ἐν ἀνταρξίᾳ οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἀλλὰ εἰσὶ καὶ ζῶσι παρὰ τῷ διαπύτῃ, καὶ ὅσως ἂν τὸ σμύότατον κήρυγμα διηγήσονται, ὡς ἐλπίς ἐστιν ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν εὐχομένοις, ὡς ἐν ἀποδημίᾳ τυγχάνοντων ὠφελῇ δὲ καὶ ἡ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γινόμενη εὐχὴ, εἰ καὶ τὰ ὅλα τῶν αἰτιωμάτων μὴ ἀποκόπτοι· ἀλλ' οὕτως διὰ τὸ πολλάκις ἐν κόσμῳ ἡμῶς ὄντας σφάλλιναι ἀκουσίως τε καὶ ἰκυσίως, ἵνα τὸ ἐντιμώτερον σημεῖον καὶ γὰρ δικαίον ποιούμεθα τὴν μνήμην, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτωλῶν ὑπὲρ μὲν ἀμαρτωλῶν, ὑπὲρ ἱλίους Θεοῦ δέομενοι· ὑπὲρ δὲ δικαίων καὶ πατέρων, καὶ πατριαρχῶν, καὶ προφητῶν, καὶ ἀποστόλων, καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν, καὶ μαρτύρων, καὶ ὁμολογητῶν, ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ ἀναχωρητῶν, καὶ πάντες τοῦ τάγματος, ἵνα τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀφορίσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τάξεως, διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν τιμῆς καὶ σέβας αὐτῷ ἀποδῶμεν.

tage to sinners, though it did not wholly cancel their crimes; because it put a distinction between the perfection of Christ, and the imperfection of all other men: therefore they prayed for righteous men, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, bishops, hermits, and all orders of men." And it appears from all the ancient liturgies under the names of St. Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Cyril,^k that they prayed for all saints, the Virgin Mary herself not excepted. And it is remarkable, that in the old Roman Missal they were used to pray for the soul of St. Leo, as Hincmar,^l a writer of the ninth age, informs us, who says the prayer ran in this form: "Grant, O Lord, that this oblation may be of advantage to the soul of thy servant Leo, which thou hast appointed to be for the relaxation of the sins of the whole world." But this was thought so incongruous in the following ages, that in the later sacramentaries, or missals, it was changed into this form: "Grant, O Lord, we beseech thee, that this oblation may be of advantage to us by the intercession of St. Leo," as Pope Innocent the Third assures us it was in his time.^m And such another alteration was made in Pope Gregory's *Sacramentarium*. For in the old Greek and Latin edition there is this prayer:ⁿ "Remember, O Lord, all thy servants, men and women, who have gone before us in the seal of the faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace: we beseech thee, O Lord, to grant them, and all that rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, light, and peace, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord." But in the new reformed missals, it is altered thus,^o

^k See these quoted by Bishop Usher's Answer to the Challenge, p. 136, and Dallæum de Poenis et Satisfaction. lib. v. c. viii.

^l Hincmar. de Prædestin. lib. i. c. xxxiv. tom. i. p. 297. Adnue nobis, Domine, ut animæ famuli tui Leonis hæc prosit oblatio, quam immolando totius mundi tribuisti relaxari delicta.

^m Innocent. Ep. in Decretal. Gregor. lib. iii. tit. xli. c. vi. p. 1372. Missal. Fest. Leonis. Jun. xxviii.

ⁿ Bibl. Patr. Gr.-Lat. tom. ii. p. 129. Μνήσθητι καὶ τῶν δούλων σου πάντων καὶ πασῶν, οἱ μετὰ τοῦ σημείου τῆς πίστεως προσηλθόντες ἡμῶν, καὶ ὕκνον εἰρήνης ἐκποιμηνται· καὶ διόμιθά σου, ἵνα πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναπαυσαμένοις χώραν ἀναψύξεως, καὶ φωτὸς, καὶ εἰρήνης παράσῃ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

^o Missal. Roman. in Canone Missæ, p. 301, (p. 202, edit. Colon. 1614.)

“Remember, Lord, thy servants and handmaids N. and N. that have gone before us,” &c. That they might not seem to pray for saints, as well as others that were in purgatory. Which makes it very probable, that St. Cyril's Catechism has also been tampered with, and a clause put in, which speaks of their praying to God by the intercession of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs: since the ancient liturgies prayed for them as well as for all others. St. Chrysostom says expressly, they offered for the martyrs.^p And so it is in his Greek Liturgy,¹ “We offer unto thee this reasonable service for the faithful deceased, our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, religious persons, and every spirit perfected in the faith; but especially for our most holy, immaculate, most blessed lady, the mother of God, and ever Virgin Mary;” though, as Bishop Usher has observed, some of the Latin translators have also given a perverse turn to these words, rendering them thus: ^r “We offer unto thee this reasonable service for the faithful deceased, our forefathers and fathers, by the intercession of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and all the saints;” for it sounded ill to the Latin ears to hear St. Chrysostom say, the ancient Church prayed for saints and martyrs; and yet, he says it, not only in the fore-mentioned places, but over and over again in others. In his forty-first homily, upon the first of Corinthians, speaking against immoderate sorrow for the death of sinners, he says,^s

Memento, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum N. et N. qui nos præceserunt cum signo fidei, et dormiunt in somno pacis.

^p Chrysostom. Hom. xxi. in Acta, tom. iv. edit. Sevil. p. 736, (p. 204, edit. Francof.) Τί οὖν τὸ ὑπὲρ μαρτύρων προσφέρειν, κ. τ. λ.

^q Ibid. Liturg. tom. iv. p. 614, (p. 540, edit. cit.) “Ἐνι προσφίρομίν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην λατρίαν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστει ἀναπαυσαμένων προπατέρων, πατέρων, πατριάρχων, προφητῶν, καὶ ἀποστόλων, κηρύκων, εὐαγγελιστῶν, μαρτύρων, ὁμολογητῶν, ἡγρεασιτῶν, καὶ παντὸς πνεύματος ἐν πίστι τιτιλιωμένου, ἑξαίρετως τῆς παναγίας, ἀχράντου, ὑπὲρ ὁλοκλημῆνης διαποιήσε ἡμῶν θιοτίκου, καὶ αὐταρβήνου Μαρίας.

^r Usher's Answer to the Challenge, p. 136.

^s Chrysostom. Hom. xli. in 1 Cor. p. 701, (p. 468, edit. Francof.) Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀμαρτωλὸς ἀπῆλθι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δι' ἡμῶν χαίρειν, ὅτι ἐνίκησεν τὰ ἀμαρτήματα, καὶ οὐ προσέθηκε τῇ κακίᾳ, καὶ βοηθεῖν ὡς ἂν οἶν τι ἦ, οὐ δακρύειν, ἀλλ' εὐχαῖς, καὶ ἱκετηρίαις, καὶ ἰλημοσύναις, καὶ προσφοραῖς· οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ταῦτα ἱπινύονται, οὐδὲ ἐκτῇ μῆνῃ ποιούμεθα τῶν ἀπολλόντων ἐκ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων, καὶ ὑπὲρ

“They are not so much to be lamented, as succoured with prayers, and supplications, and alms, and oblations; for these things were not designed in vain, neither is it without reason that we make mention of those that are deceased in the holy mysteries, interceding for them to the Lamb that is slain to take away the sins of the world, but that some consolation may hence arise to them. Neither is it in vain, that he who stands at the altar, when the tremendous mysteries are celebrated, cries, ‘We offer unto thee for all those that are asleep in Christ, and all that make commemorations for them;’ for if there were no commemorations made for them, these things would not be said. Let us not, therefore, grow weary in giving them our assistance, and offering prayers for them, for the common propitiation of the whole world is now before us; therefore we now pray for the whole world, and name them with martyrs, with confessors, with priests, for we are all one body, though one member be more excellent than another; and we may obtain a general pardon for them by our prayers, by our alms, by the help of those that are named together with them.” He supposes here that the saints prayed for sinners, though, at the same time, the Church prayed both for the saints, and martyrs, and sinners, together. In another place he says,¹ “Prayers were made, in general, for all those that were deceased in the faith; and none but catechumens, dying in a voluntary

αὐτῶν πρόσμιν, δίομινοι τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ κυρίου, τοῦ λαβόντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου· ἀλλ’ ἵνα τις ἐντιϋθῇ αὐτοῖς γίνηται παραμυθία· οὐδὲ μάτην ὁ παριστάς τῃ θυσιαστηρίῳ, τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων τιλουμένω, βοᾷ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κοικοιμηνίων, καὶ τῶν τὰς μνίας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτιλούντων· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν αἱ μνίαι ἰγίνοντο, οὐδ’ ἂν ταῦτα ἐλίχθη. . . . μὴ δὲ ἀποκάμωμιν τοῖς ἀπειθοῦσι βοηθοῦντες, καὶ προσφίροντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ὑχάες· καὶ γὰρ τὸ κινὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης κῆται καθάρσιον· διὰ τοῦτο θαρρύνοντες ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης δίομιθα τότε, καὶ μετὰ μαρτύρων αὐτοὺς καλοῦμεν, μετὰ ὁμολογητῶν, μετὰ ἱερῶν καὶ γὰρ ἐν σῶμᾳ ἴσμεν ἅπαντας, καὶ λαμπρότερα μίλη μιλῶν, καὶ δυνατὸν πάντοθεν συγγνώμην αὐτοῖς συναγαγῆναι, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑχῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δάρεων, ἀπὸ τῶν μετ’ αὐτῶν καλουμένων.

¹ Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Philipp. p. 1225, (p. 32, edit. Francof. in fine.)

“Οταν ἰσθῆται λαὸς ἐλόκληρος χεῖρας ἀνατίνοντες, πλήρωμα ἱερᾶτικόν, καὶ προκίται ἡ φρικτὴ θυσία, πῶς οὐ δυσωπήσομεν ὑπὲρ τούτων τὸν Θεὸν παρακαλοῦντες; ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν περὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει παρελθόντων· οἱ δὲ κατηχούμενοι οὐδὲ ταύτης καταξιώνται τῆς παραμυθίας, ἀλλὰ ἀπιστοῦνται πάσης τῆς τοιαύτης βοηθείας, πλὴν μίως τινος· ποίας δὲ ταύτης; ἔστιτι πίσειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίδοναι, κ. τ. λ.

neglect of baptism, were excluded from the benefit of them. At that time," says he, "when all the people stand with their hands lift up to heaven, and all the company of priests with them, and the tremendous sacrifice lies upon the altar; how shall we not move God to mercy, when we call upon him for those that are deceased in the faith? I speak of them only; for the catechumens are not allowed this consolation, but are deprived of all assistance, except only giving alms for them." This, then, was a punishment inflicted upon the catechumens, of which Chrysostom speaks in other places;^u and it appears to have been a settled rule, by some ancient canons of the Church,^w of which I have had occasion to speak in a former Book,^x to deny catechumens the benefit of the Church's prayers after death. Chrysostom says, again,^y that "A bishop is to be intercessor for all the world, and to pray to God to be merciful to the sins of all men, not only the living, but the dead also." Cassian says, also,^z "The *biothanati*, as they called them" [that is, men that laid violent hands upon themselves], "were excluded from the benefit of the Church's prayers;" and, therefore, when one Hero, an old hermit, had, by the delusions of Satan, cast himself into a deep well, Pafnutius, the abbot, could hardly be prevailed upon to let him be reckoned any other than a self-murderer, and unworthy of the memorial and oblation that was made for all those that were at rest in peace. Which is also noted in

^u Chrysostom. Hom. xxiv. in Joan. (130), p. 159, (edit. Francof.) Εἰ γίνωτο, δὲ μὴ γίνωτο, ἀπροδοκῆτου τῆς τελειότης ἰσχυροῦς, ἀμνηστους ἐντιϋθίν ἀπιδιδόν, καὶ μυρία ἔχωμεν ἀγαθὰ, οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς ἕτερον διαδίδεται, ἢ γίνωτο, καὶ σκόληξ ἰσχύος, καὶ πῦρ ἄσβεστον, καὶ δισμὰ ἄλυτα· ἀλλὰ μὴ γίνωτό τινα τῶν ταῦτα ἀκούοντων ἐκείνης παρασθῆναι τῆς κολάσεως. τοῦτο δὲ ἴσται, ἂν τῶν ἁγίων καταξιοθέντες μυστηρίων, χερσὶν καὶ ἔργον, καὶ λίθους τιμίους οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον. — Id. Hom. i. in Acta, p. 14.

^w Conc. Bracar. I. c. xxxv. (Conc. ii. c. xvii. ap. Labb. tom. Conc. v. p. 841.) Placuit, ut catechumenis, &c. Vid. sub litt. seq. (*).

^x Book x. chap. ii. sect. xviii.

^y Chrysostom. de Sacerdot. lib. vi. c. iv. See sect. xiii. note (n), p. 102. — Hom. xxii. in Matth. p. 307, A. (p. 371, edit. Francof.) Τί μετὰ ταῦτα πίνοντας καλῶς; καὶ παρακαλῶς ἱερέας εὐχαῖσαι; ἵνα εἰς ἀνάγκησιν ἀπίλθῃ, φρεῖν, ὁ τιτελιωτῆκος, ἵνα ἴλω σὺν τὸν δικαστήν. κ. τ. λ.

^z Cassian. Collat. ii. c. v. Vix a presbytero abbate Pafnutio, narrat, potuisse obtineri, ut non inter biothanatos reputatus, etiam memoria et oblatione pausan- tium judicaretur indignus.

the Council of Braga,^a where catechumens and self-murderers are put in the same class together, as persons that deserved neither the solemnities of Christian burial, nor the usual prayers and commemoration that was made for the rest of Christians at the altar.

St. Austin, indeed, had a singular opinion in this matter about prayer for the dead; for he thought the martyrs were not properly to be prayed for as other men; because they were admitted to the immediate fruition of heaven. There goes a common saying under his name (which Pope Innocent the Third quotes as Holy Scripture^b), that he who prays for a martyr, does injury to the martyr, because they attained to perfection in this life, and have no need of the prayers of the Church,^c as all others have. Therefore he says,^d "When they were named at the altar, and their memorials celebrated, they did not commemorate them as persons for whom they prayed, as they did all others that rested in peace; but rather as men that prayed for the Church on earth, that we might follow their steps, who had attained to the perfection of charity in laying down their lives for Christ, according to that aphorism of Christ himself, 'Greater love than this hath no man, that he lay down his life for his friend.'" Upon this account, St. Austin thought the oblations and alms, that were usually offered in the Church for all the

^a Conc. Bracar. I. c. xxxv. (al. Conc. ii. cc. xvi. xvii.) Placuit, ut hi, qui sibi ipsis aut per ferrum, aut per venenum, aut per præcipitium, aut suspendium, vel quolibet modo violentam inferunt mortem, nulla pro illis in oblatione commemoratio fiat, neque cum psalmis ad sepulturam eorum cadavera deducantur. Item placuit, ut catechumenis, sine redemptione baptismi defunctis, simili modo, neque oblationis commemoratio, neque psallendi impendatur officium.

^b Innocent. in Decretal. Gregorii, lib. iii. tit. xli. c. v. Sacra Scripturæ dicit auctoritas, quod injuriam facit martyri, qui orat pro martyre.

^c Aug. Serm. xvii. de Verbis Apostoli, tom. x. p. 132. Perfectio in hac vita nonnulla est, ad quam sancti martyres pervenerunt. Ideoque habet ecclesiastica disciplina, quod fideles noverunt, quum martyres eo loco recitantur ad altare Dei, ubi non pro ipsis oretur. Injuria est enim pro martyre orare, cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari. (v. 533, C.)

^d Ibid. Tract. lxxxiv. in Joan. tom. ix. p. 185, (p. 451, edit. Basil. 1569.) Ad ipsam mensam non sic eos commemoramus, quemadmodum alios, qui in pace requiescunt, ut etiam pro eis oremus, sed magis ut ipsi pro nobis, ut eorum vestigiis adhæreamus: quia impleverunt ipsi caritatem, qua Dominus dixit, non posse esse majorem. (iii. 516, E.)

dead that had received baptism, were only thanksgivings for such as were very good;* and propitiations for those that were not very bad; and for such as were very evil, though they were no helps to them when they were dead, yet they were some consolation to the living. But, as Bishop Usher rightly observes,† “This was but a harsh interpretation of the prayers of the Church, to imagine that one and the same act of praying should be a petition for some, and for others a thanksgiving only;” and, therefore, it is more reasonable to suppose, that the Church designed to pray for all, especially since St. Austin‡ himself owns that the Church made supplications for all that died in the society of the Christian and Catholic faith, as all the ancient forms of prayer do manifestly evince, beyond all possibility of exception.

SECT. XVII.—*Upon what Grounds the Ancient Church prayed for the Dead, Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, as well as all others.*

Supposing, then, that the ancient Church made prayers for saints and martyrs, as well as all others, it remains to be inquired, upon what grounds and reasons she observed this custom: whether upon the modern supposition of a purgatory fire, or upon other reasons more agreeable to such a general practice? That she did not do it upon the supposition of purgatory, appears evidently from what has been already observed out of the public offices of the Church, that she prayed for all the saints, martyrs, confessors, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and even the Virgin Mary herself, and all other holy men and women, from the foundation of the

* Aug. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. cx. Quum ergo sacrificia sive altaris, sive quarumcumque eleemosynarum pro baptizatis defunctis omnibus offeruntur, pro valde bonis gratiarum actiones sunt: pro non valde malis propitiaciones sunt: pro valde malis etiamsi nulla sunt adjumenta mortuorum, qualescumque vivorum consolationes sunt. Quibus autem prosunt, aut ad hoc prosunt, ut sit plena remissio, aut certe ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio. (vi. 174, E.)

† Usher's Answer to the Challenge, p. 142.

‡ Aug. de Cura pro Mortuis, c. iv. Non sunt prætermittendæ supplicationes pro spiritibus mortuorum: quas faciendas pro omnibus in Christiana et Catholica societate defunctis, etiam tacitis nominibus eorum sub generali commemoratione suscepit ecclesia. (vi. 379, B.)

world, who were supposed to be in a place of rest and happiness, and not in any place of purgation or torment. And this appears further from the private prayers made by St. Ambrose^b for the Emperors Theodosius, and Valentinian, and Gratian, and his own brother Satorus; and the directions he gives to Faustinus,ⁱ not to weep for his sister, but to make prayers and oblations for her. For all these were persons, of whom he had not the least doubt, but that their souls were in rest and happiness, as all the funeral service of the ancients supposes, where they usually sung those verses of the Psalms: "Return again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee!" And, again, "I will fear no evil, because thou art with me." And, again, "Thou art my refuge from the affliction that compasseth me about." Which St. Chrysostom often bids his hearers remember, that,^k "Whilst they prayed for the deceased party, they should not weep and lament immoderately, as the heathen did, but give God thanks for taking him to a place of rest and security;" which is utterly inconsistent with their going into the dreadful pains of purgatory. St. Austin both prayed in private for his mother Monnica,^l

^b Ambros. de Obitu Theodosii, (tom. v. opp. p. 122, edit. Paris. 1642.) Da requiem perfectam servo tuo Theodosio, requiem illam quam præparasti sanctis tuis. — De Obitu Valentin. ibid. pp. 115, 116. Beati ambo (Valentinianus et Gratianus) si quid meæ orationes valebunt. Nulla dies vos silentio præteribit, nulla inhonoratos vos mea transibit oratio, nulla nox non donatos aliqua precum mearum contextione transcurret. (iv. 189.)

ⁱ Epist. viii. ad Faustin. (lxi. edit. Paris.) Itaque non tam deplorandam quam prosequendam orationibus reor: nec læstificandam lacrimis tuis, sed magis oblationibus animam ejus Domino commendandam arbitror.

^k Chrysostom. Hom. iv. in Hehr. p. 1789, (p. 736, edit. Francof.) Ἐνύπνου τί ψάλλεις κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον Ἐπίστρεψον, ἡ ψυχὴ μου, εἰς τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου, ὅτι Κύριος ἐνηργίσθησί σοι καὶ πάλιν, Οὐ φοβηθήσομαι κακὰ, ὅτι σὺ μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ. καὶ πάλιν Σὺ μου εἶ καταφυγὴ ἀπὸ θλίψεως τῆς περιχούσης με· ἐνύπνου τί βούλονται οὗτοι οἱ ψαλμοί. — Hom. xxix. de Dormientibus, tom. v. p. 423, (Hom. xxx. p. 377, edit. cit.) Ἀλγῶν, δάκρυον, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀποδυσπιστήσης, μὴ δυσχερέης, μὴ ἀγανακτήσης τὸν ἀπειθόντα, καὶ λαμπρὰ ταῦτα αὐτῷ συμπόμενῃ ἐντάφια· ἂν μὲν γὰρ δυσχερέης, κἀκείνους καθύβρισας, καὶ τὸν λαβόντα παρώξυνας, καὶ σαυτὸν κατίβλαψας· ἂν δὲ εὐχαριστήσης, κἀκείνους ἐκίσμηνσας, καὶ τὸν λαβόντα ἰδοῦσας, καὶ σαυτὸν ἀφίλησας. — Vid. Cassian. c. v. cit. supra, sub litt. (*).

^l Aug. Confess. lib. ix. c. xii. Neque in eis precibus quas tibi fudimus, quum offerretur pro ea (Monnica matre) sacrificium pretii nostri, jam juxta sepulcrum posito cadavere, priusquam deponeretur, sicut illic fieri solet, nec in eis precibus

and also speaks of the Church's prayers for her at her funeral, and afterward at the altar : and yet he made no question of her going hence, from a state of piety here to a state of joy and felicity hereafter. And, after the same manner, Gregory Nazianzen^m prays God to receive the soul of his brother Cæsarius, who was lately regenerated by the Spirit in baptism. It is certain these prayers were not founded on a belief of a purgatory fire after death, but upon a supposition that they were going to a place of rest and happiness, which was their first reason for praying for them, that God would receive them to himself, and deliver them from condemnation. 2. Upon the same presumption, some of their prayers for the dead were always eucharistical, or thanksgivings for their deliverance out of the troubles of this sinful world ; as appears not only from the fore-mentioned testimonies of Chrysostom, but from the author under the name of Dionysius ;ⁿ who, in describing their funeral service, speaks of the εὐχὴ εὐχαριστήριος, ' the eucharistical prayers,' whereby they gave God thanks not only for martyrs, but all Christians that died in the true faith and fear of God. A third reason of praying for them was, because they justly conceived all men to die with some remainders of frailty and corruption ; and, therefore, desired that God would deal with them according to his mercy, and not in strict justice, according to their merits ; for no one, then, was thought to have any real merit or title to eternal happiness, but only upon God's promises and mercy. St. Austin discourses excellently upon this point in the case of his mother Monnica, after this manner :^o " I now pour

ego flevi, &c. (i. 123, B.)—Ibid. c. xiii. Scio misericorditer operatam, et ex corde dimisisse debita debitoribus suis : dimitte illi et tu debita sua, si qua etiam contraxit per tot annos post aquam salutis. Dimitte, Domine, dimitte, obsecro, ne intres cum ea in judicium. (i. 124, B.)

^m Nazianz. Orat. x. p. 176. Νῦν μὲν δίχαιο Καίσαρειον ἀπαρχὴν τοῦς ἡμῖν ἀποδημίας.

ⁿ Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch. c. vii. p. 408. Εἴτα τιλῶ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν εὐχαριστήριον εὐχὴν ἡ ἱεράρχης.

^o Aug. Confess. lib. ix. c. xiii. (i. 123, F.) Ego jam sanato corde ab illo vulnere, in quo poterat redargui carnalis adfectus, fundo tibi, Deus noster, pro illa famula tua longe aliud lacrimarum genus, quod manat de concusso Spiritu consideratione periculorum omnis animæ, quæ in Adam moritur. Quamquam illa

out unto thee, my God, another sort of tears for thy hand-maid, flowing from a trembling spirit, in consideration of the danger that every soul is in that dies in Adam. For although she was made alive in Christ, and lived so in the days of her flesh, as to bring glory to thy name by her faith and practice, yet I dare not say, that from the time she was regenerated by baptism, no word came out of her mouth against thy command. And thou hast told us by him who is truth itself, that 'Whosoever shall say to his brother, 'Thou fool,' shall be in danger of hell-fire.' And wo to the most laudable life of man, if thou shouldst sift and examine it without mercy. But because thou art not extreme to mark what is done amiss, we have hope and confidence to find some place and room for indulgence with thee. But whoever reckons up his true merits before thee, what does he more than recount thy own gifts? O that all men would know themselves, and they that glory, glory in the Lord! I, therefore, O my Praise, and my Life, the God of my heart, setting aside a little her good actions, for which I joyfully give thee thanks, now make intercession for the sins of my mother. Hear me through the medicine of his wounds, who hanged upon the tree, and now sitteth at thy

in Christo vivificata, etiam nondum a carne resoluta sic vixerit, ut laudetur nomen tuum in fide moribusque ejus, non tamen audeo dicere, ex quo eam per baptismum regenerasti, nullum verbum exisse ab ore ejus contra præceptum tuum. Et dictum est a Veritate, Filio tuo, 'Si quis dixerit fratri suo, Fatue, reus erit gehennæ ignis.' Et væ etiam laudabili vitæ hominum, si remota misericordia discutias eam. Quia vero non exquiris delicta vehementer, fiducialiter speramus aliquem apud te locum invenire indulgentiæ. Quisquis autem tibi enumerat vera merita sua, quid tibi enumerat nisi munera tua? O si cognoscant se homines homines; et qui gloriatur, in Domino gloriatur! Ego itaque, laus mea et vita mea, Deus cordis mei, sepositis paulisper bonis ejus actibus, pro quibus tibi gaudens gratias ago, nunc pro peccatis matris meæ deprecor te, exaudi me per medicinam vulnerum nostrorum, quæ pependit in ligno; et sedens ad dexteram tuam, te interpellat pro nobis. . . . Non se interponat nec vi nec insidiis leo et draco; neque enim respondebit illa nihil se debere, ne convincatur et obtineatur ab accusatore callido: sed respondebit dimissa debita sua ab eo, cui nemo reddet quod pro nobis non debens reddidit. Sit ergo in pace cum viro, ante quem nulli et post quem nulli nupta est, cui servivit fructum tibi adferens cum tolerantia, ut eum quoque lucraretur tibi. Et inspira, Domine meus, Deus meus, inspira servis tuis fratribus meis, filiis tuis dominis meis; quibus et voce, et corde, et litteris servio, ut quotquot hæc legerint, meminerint ad altare tuum Monnicæ famulæ tuæ, cum Patricio quondam ejus conjuge.

right hand to make intercession for us." He adds, a little after, that he believed God had granted what he asked; yet he prays, "That the lion and the dragon might not interpose himself, either by his open violence or subtlety: for she would not answer that she was no debtor, lest the crafty adversary should convict her, and lay hold of her; but she would answer, That her sins were forgiven her by him, to whom no man can return what he gave to us without any obligation. Let her, therefore, rest in peace with her husband; and do thou, my Lord God, inspire all those, thy servants, that read this, to remember thy handmaid Monnica at thy altar, with Patricius her consort." This was not a prayer for persons in the pains of purgatory, but for such as rested in peace, only without dependence upon their own merits; and with an humble reliance upon God's mercy, that he would not suffer them to be devoured by the roaring lion, nor deal extremely with them for the sins of human frailty. 4. Another like reason for these prayers, is that which we have heard before, out of Epiphanius,^p "That it was to put a distinction between the perfection of Christ, and the imperfection of all other men, saints, martyrs, apostles, prophets, confessors, &c. he being the only person for whom prayer was not then made in the Church." 5. They prayed for all Christians, as a testimony both of their respect and love to the dead, and of their own belief of the soul's immortality; to shew, as Epiphanius words it in the same place, that they believed that they who were deceased, were yet alive, and not extinguished, but still in being, and living with the Lord. 6. Whereas the soul is but in an imperfect state of happiness till the resurrection, when the whole man shall obtain a complete victory over death, and by the last judgment be established in an endless state of consummate happiness and glory; the Church had a particular respect to this in her prayers for the righteous, that both the living and the dead might finally attain this blessed estate of a glorious resurrection. It is observed by some, that there are some prayers yet extant in the Roman Mass, which are

^p Epiphan. Hæres. lxxv. Aelian. n. vii. cit. sect. xvi. sub litt. (!), p. 108.

conformable to this opinion: as that which prays,⁴ that “God would absolve the souls of his servants from every bond of sin, and bring them to the glory of the resurrection,” &c.

All these were general reasons of praying for the dead, without the least intimation of their being tormented in the temporary pains of a purgatory fire. Besides which, they had some particular opinions, which tended to promote this practice. For, first, a great many of the ancients believed, that the souls of all the righteous, except martyrs, were sequestered out of heaven, in some place invisible to mortal eye, which they called Hades, or Paradise, or Abraham’s bosom; a place of refreshment and joy, where they expected a completer happiness at the end of all things. This is the known opinion of Hermes Pastor, Justin Martyr, Pope Pius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Caius Romanus, Victorinus Martyr, Novatian, Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory Nyssen, Prudentius, Austin, and Chrysostom. Therefore, in praying for the dead, they may be supposed to have some reference to this, and to desire that the souls of the righteous, thus sequestered for a time, might at last be brought to the perfect fruition of happiness in heaven.

2. Many of the ancients held the opinion of the millennium, or the reign of Christ a thousand years upon earth before the final day of judgment: and they supposed likewise, that men should rise, some sooner, some later, to this happy state, according to their merits and preparations for it. And, therefore, some of them prayed for the deceased on this supposition, “That they might obtain a part in this resurrection, and a speedier admittance into this kingdom:” it being reckoned a sort of punishment, not to be admitted with the first that should rise to this state of glory. Tertullian plainly refers to this, when he says,⁵ “Every little offence is to be punished by delaying men’s resurrection.” And, therefore, he says,⁶ “They were wont to pray for the

⁴ See Du Moulin’s Novelty of Popery, book vii. chap. i. p. 459.

⁵ Tertul. de Anima, c. lviii. *Modicum quodque delictum mora resurrectionis luendum, &c.*

⁶ De Monogam. c. x. *Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium interim adpos-*

souls of the deceased, that they might not only rest in peace for the present, but also obtain part in the first resurrection." And, for this reason, St. Ambrose prayed for Gratian and Valentinian,[†] "That God would raise them with the first, and recompense their untimely death with a timely resurrection." And he says elsewhere,^u "That they that come not to the first resurrection, but are reserved unto the second, shall be burned, until they fulfil the time between the first and second resurrection; or if they have not fulfilled that, they shall remain longer in punishment. Therefore let us pray, that we may obtain a part in the first resurrection." Bishop Usher also shews out of some Gothic Missals,^w "That the Church had anciently several prayers directed to this very purpose." 3. Many of the ancients believed, that there would be a fire of probation, through which all must pass at the last day, even the prophets and apostles; and even the Virgin Mary herself not excepted. Which is asserted not only by Origen,^x Irenæus,^y and Lactantius,^z but also by St. Ambrose,^a who says, after Origen, "That all

tulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium. — Confer. lib. iii. cont. Marcion. c. xxiv. Post mille annos, intra quam ætatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio, pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium, &c.

[†] Ambros. de Obitu Valentin. ad finem. Te quæso, summe Deus, ut carissimos juvenes matura resurrectione suscites et resuscites; ut immaturum hunc vitæ istius cursum matura resurrectione compenses. (Paris. 1836, iv. 189.)

^u Ibid. in Psalm i. (vol. ii. 60.) Qui non veniunt ad primam resurrectionem, sed ad secundam reservantur, isti urentur, donec impleant tempora inter primam et secundam resurrectionem: aut si non impleverint, diutius in supplicio permanebunt. Ideo ergo rogemus, ut in prima resurrectione partem habere mereamur.

^w Usher's Answer to the Challenge, p. 151.

^x Origen. Hom. iii. in Psalm. xxxvi. p. 446, (p. 504, edit. Basil. 1557, p. 281, c. edit. Paris. 1604.) Ut ego arbitror, omnes nos venire necesse est ad illum ignem. Etiam si Paulus sit aliquis vel Petrus, venit tamen ad illum ignem.

^y Iren. lib. iv. c. ix. †.

^z Lactant. lib. vii. c. xxi. (p. 863, edit. Walchii Lips. 1715, 8vo.) Sed et justos quum judicaverit, etiam igni eos examinabit.

^a Ambros. Sermon. xx. in Psalm. cxviii. (tom. ii. p. 764, edit. Paris. 1642.) Omnes oportet transire per flammam, sive ille Joannes Evangelista sit, quem ita dilexit Dominus, ut de eo diceret ad Petrum; 'Si eum volo manere, quid ad te? tu me sequere.' De morte ejus aliqui dubitaverunt, de transitu per ignem dubitare non possumus, quia in paradiso est, nec separatur a Christo. Sive ille sit Petrus, qui claves accepit regni cælorum, qui supra mare ambulavit, oportet dicat, 'Transivimus per ignem et aquam, et induxisti nos in refrigerium.' (ii. 399.)

must pass through the flames, though it be John the Evangelist, — though it be Peter.” “The sons of Levi shall be purged by fire,^b Ezekiel, Daniel, &c. And these having been tried by fire, shall say, ‘We have passed through fire and water.’” And St. Hilary, much after the same manner,^c “They that are baptized with the Holy Ghost, are yet to be perfected by the fire of judgment.” For so he interprets those words of the Evangelist, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” And again,^d “Do we desire the day of judgment, in which we must undergo the exact scrutiny of fire; in which we must give an account of every idle word; in which those grievous punishments for expiating souls from sin, must be endured? If the Virgin herself, who conceived God in her womb, must undergo the severity of judgment, who is so bold as to desire to be judged by God?” There are many like passages in Gregory Nazianzen,^e and Nyssen,^f and St. Jerom,^g and St. Austin,^h which the Romish writers commonly produce for the fire of

^b Ambros. Hom. iii. in Psalm. xxxvi. (tom. ii. opp. p. 693, h. cit. edit.) *Ignē purgabantur filii Levi, igne Ezechiel, igne Daniel. Sed hi, etsi per ignem examinabuntur, dicent tamen, ‘Transivimus per ignem et aquam.’*

^c Hilary. in Matt. c. ii. p. 148, (Paris, 1693, p. 616, E.) *Salutis nostræ et iudicii tempus designat in Domino, dicens, ‘Ille baptizabit vos in Spiritu Sancto et igni:’ quia baptizatis in Spiritu Sancto, reliquum sit consummari igne iudicii.*

^d Ibid. Enarrat. in Psalm. cxviii. Littera Gimel, (p. 254, edit. cit.) (261, A.) *An quum ex omni otioso verbo rationem simus præstituri, diem iudicii concupiscemus, in quo nobis est ille indefessus ignis subeundus, in quo subeunda sunt gravia illa expianda a peccatis animæ supplicia? Beatæ Mariæ animam gladius pertransibit, ut revelentur multorum cordium cogitationes. Si in iudicii severitatem capax illa Dei virgo ventura est, desiderare quis audebit a Deo judicari?*

^e Nazianz. Orat. xlii. p. 697. *Στήσεις τῷ σώματι τὴν κατ’ ἡμῶν τυραννίδα δέξῃς Ἰσὴν, Κύριε, καὶ ὡς κάμπτουσιν, ἢ τὴν σὴν ψῆφον, εἰ παρὰ σοῦ καθαρεύμεθα.*

^f Nyssen. Orat. de Mortuis, (tom. iii. p. 634, d. Paris. 1638.) . . . *ἄτοι κατὰ τὴν παρῶσαν ζωὴν, διὰ προσευχῆς τι καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἐκκαθαρίσῃς, ἢ μετὰ τὴν βίωσιν μετανάσταςιν, διὰ τῆς τοῦ καθαρείου πυρὸς χωνίαις. . . .*

^g Hieron. in Esa. lxvi. ad Comma ultimum. *Sicut diaboli et omnium negatorum atque impiorum, qui dixerunt in corde suo, ‘Non est Deus,’ credimus æterna tormenta; sic peccatorum atque impiorum et tamen Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atque purganda, moderatam arbitramur et mixtam clementiæ sententiam iudicis. (Bened. Venet. iv. 832.)*

^h Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. xx. c. xxv. in verba Malachiæ: ‘Ipse ingreditur quasi ignis conflatorii,’ &c. hæc habet. Ex his quæ dicta sunt, videtur evidentius apparere, in illo iudicio quasdam quorundam purgatorias penas futuras.

purgatory; whereas they plainly relate to this "purging sacrament," as Origen calls it;ⁱ or, in St. Austin's language, "the purging pains of the fire of judgment at the last day." And the fear of this was another reason of their praying for the dead. 4. Some of the ancients thought likewise, that the prayers of the Church were of some use to mitigate the pains of the damned souls, though not effectual for their total deliverance. And, lastly, that they served to augment the glory of the saints in happiness. St. Austin says,^j "They were of use to render the damnation of the wicked more tolerable." And this was the opinion of Prudentius^k and St. Chrysostom,^l who advises men to pray for the dead upon this account, that it would bring some consolation to them, though but a little; or if none at all to them, yet it would be accepted of God as a pleasing sacrifice from those that offered it. And the like may be read in Paulinus,^m and the author of the Questions to Antiochus, under the name of Athanasius.ⁿ St. Chrysostom says further,^o "That their

ⁱ Origen. Hom. xiv. in Luc. p. 223, (p. 257, edit. Basil. 1557.) Ego puto, quod, et post resurrectionem ex mortuis, indigeamus sacramento eluente nos atque purgante.

^j Aug. Euchirid. c. cx. Quibus prosunt (preces) aut ad hoc prosunt, ut sit plena remissio, aut certe ut tolerabilior fiat ipsa damnatio.

^k Prudent. Cathemerinon. Carm. v. de Cereo Paschali.

Sunt et spiritibus sæpe nocentibus
Pœnarum celebres sub Styge feriæ,
Illa nocte sacer qua rediit Deus
Stagnis ad superos ex Acheronticis.

^l Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Philipp. p. 1225, (p. 32, fin. edit. Francof.) Κλαίωμεν οὖν τούτους, βοηθῶμεν αὐτοῖς κατὰ δύνανται, ἰπινῶμεν αὐτοῖς τινα βοηθίαν, μικρὰν μὲν, βοηθίην δὲ ἡμῶς δυναμένην· πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ; αὐτοὶ τι εὐχόμενοι, καὶ ἰστέους παρακαλοῦντες εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ποιῆσαι, πίνῃσιν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίδόντες συνηῶς· ἔχου τιτὰ τὸ πρῶγμα παραθυρίαν. κ. τ. λ. — (See below, note °).

^m Paulin. Ep. xix. Petimus . . . ut orationibus tuis condonetur tibi, ut et illius animam, vel de minimo sanctitatis tuæ digito distillans, refrigerii gutta respergat.

ⁿ Athanas. Quæst. ad Antioch. quæst. xxxiv. (tom. ii. p. 275, edit. Paris. 1698.) Τί οὖν, Οὐκ αἰσθάνονται τινος εὐεργισίας καὶ αἱ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ψυχὰι, γινομένων ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν συνάξιων, καὶ εὐποιῶν, καὶ προσφορῶν; Ἀποκ. Εἰ μὴ τινος εὐεργισίας μετιύχον ἐκ τούτου, οὐκ ἂν ἐν τῇ προσκομιδῇ ἱμνημοσύνητε, κ. τ. λ. (Colon. 1686, vol. ii. p. 343.)

^o Chrysostom. Hom. xxxii. in Matth. p. 307, (p. 374, edit. Francof.) Προσθήκη γίνηται μισθοῦ καὶ ἀντιδόσεως.

prayers and alms were of use to procure an addition to the rewards and retribution of the righteous." These are all the reasons we meet with in the ancients for praying for souls departed; none of which have any relation to their being tormented in the fire of purgatory, but most of them tend directly to overthrow it. Whence we may safely conclude, that though the ancients generally prayed for the dead, at least from the time of Tertullian, who first speaks of it; yet they did it not upon those principles, which are now so stiffly contended for in the Romish Church. Which is also evident from many ancient forms still remaining in the Mass Book, and the liturgies of the modern Greeks, who continue to pray for the dead, without any belief of purgatory: as it were easy to demonstrate out of their rituals, but that it is wholly foreign to the design of the present discourse.

SECT. XVIII.—*A short Account of the Diptychs, and their Use in the Ancient Church.*

There is one thing more to be noted upon this matter, that some time before they made oblation for the dead, it was usual, in some ages, to recite the names of such eminent bishops, or saints, or martyrs, as were particularly to be mentioned in this part of the service. To this purpose they had certain books, which they called their 'holy books,' and commonly their 'diptychs,' from their being folded together, wherein the names of such persons were written, that the deacon might rehearse them, as occasion required, in the time of Divine service. Cardinal Bona^p and Schelstrate make three sorts of these diptychs; one, wherein the names

^p Bona Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xii. n. i. p. 346.—Schelstrat. de Conc. Antioch. lib. ii. c. vi. p. 216. Invenio tria fuisse genera diptychorum sive tabularum, quibus nomina in singulis ecclesiis inscribebantur. Primum erat peculiare episcoporum, eorum præsertim, qui illam ecclesiam rexerunt, dummodo probitate ac sanctis moribus claruissent. Secundum vivorum, in quibus eorum nomina descripta erant, qui adhuc viventes, dignitate aliqua vel beneficiis illi ecclesiæ collatis conspicui, vel alio titulo bene meriti erant. In his primo loco Romanus pontifex, tum alii patriarchæ et proprius antistes, ac reliqui clero adscripti recensebantur: postea imperator, principes, magistratus, et populus fidelis. Tertium erat mortuorum, qui in Catholica communione decesserant. Notat Bona, lib. ii. c. xii. n. i. &c.

of bishops only were written, and more particularly such bishops as had been governors of that particular church: a second, wherein the names of the living were written, who were eminent and conspicuous either for any office and dignity, or some benefaction and good work, whereby they had deserved well of the Church: in this rank were the patriarchs and bishops of great sees, and the bishop and clergy of that particular Church; together with the emperors and magistrates, and others most conspicuous among the people: the third was, the book containing the names of such as were deceased in Catholic communion. The first and the last of these seem to be much the same, and the consideration of them is only proper to this place. For the recital of the names of the living, as benefactors by their oblations, has been spoken of already,^a and here we are only concerned with the dead. Of this there is no mention made in the Constitutions, which seems to argue, that the custom of rehearsing the diptychs was not brought into the rituals of that Church, whence the compiler of that book made his collections. But Cyprian^r and Tertullian^s speak of them under another name; and Theodoret mentions them in the case of St. Chrysostom, whose name for some time was left out of the diptychs, because he died excommunicate (though unjustly), by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, and other Eastern bishops, with whom the Western Church would not communicate^t till they had restored his name to the diptychs again. The author under the name of Dionysius^u gives this

^a Book xv. chap. ii. sect. iv.—Book ii. chap. xx. sect. v.

^r Cyprian. Epist. lxxi. al. ad Plebem Furnitan. (p. 170, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Quod episcopi, antecessores nostri, religiose considerantes et salubriter providentes, censuerunt, ne quis frater excedens, ad tutelam vel curam clericum nominaret: ac si quis hoc fecisset, non offerretur pro eo, nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. Neque enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece, qui ab altari sacerdotes et ministros voluit avocare. (P. 2.)

^s Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. iii. Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus.

^t Theodoret. lib. v. c. xxxiv. (Cant. 234, 39.) Τελιωνθήσαντες τοῦ μεγάλου διδασκάλου τῆς οἰκουμένης, οὐ πρότερον οἱ τῆς ἰσπρίας ἐπισκοπῆς τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τῇ ἰώρ, καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Βοσπόρῳ καὶ τῇ Θράκῃ τὴν κοινωσίαν ἡσπάσαντο, ὥς ἐκείνου τοῦ Διοκισίου ἀνδρὸς τοῦτομα ταῖς τιμῶσιν ἐπισκοπῇς συντάξας.

^u Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. pp. 253, 254, (p. 294, edit. Antwerp. 1634.)

account of them : "That after the salutation of the kiss of peace, the diptychs were read, which set forth the names of those who had lived righteously, and had attained to the perfections of a virtuous life; which was done, partly to excite and conduct the living to the same happy state by following their good example; and partly to celebrate the memory of them as still living, according to the principles of religion, and not properly dead, but only translated by death to a more divine life." It appears from this author, that these diptychs were then read before the consecration, immediately after the kiss of peace. And so it is in the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas, which makes frequent mention of them, and particularly in one place notes the time of reading them,^v namely, after the reading of the Gospel and the Creed : for by this time the Creed was also become a part of the communion-service in the Eastern Church : therefore it is said, after the reading of the Gospel, when the communion-service was *begun* (not *ended*, as the Latin translation falsely renders it), 'the Creed was read according to custom,' τοῦ ἁγίου μαθήματος κατὰ τὸ σύνθηες λεχθέντος (not the prayers and prefaces going before the oblation, as some learned men,^x not understanding the true meaning of the word μάθημα, render it *lectio*, and interpret

Τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν πτυχῶν ἡ μετὰ τὴν εἰρήνην ἀνάρρησις, ἀνακηρύττει τοὺς ἰδίως βεβιωπόντας, καὶ πρὸς ἰσαρίτου ζωῆς τιλείωσιν ἀμειψαστάτως ἀφικομένους· ἡμᾶς μὲν, ἐπὶ τὴν δι' ὁμοιότητος αὐτῶν μακαρίστην ἔξιν καὶ θιοιδῇ λῆξιν προτρέπουσα, καὶ χυρᾶγωγῶσα, τοὺς δι' ὡς ζῶντας ἀνακηρύττουσα, καὶ ὡς ἡ θιολογία φησὶν, οὐ νεκρωθέντας, ἀλλ' εἰς θιοστάτην ζῶν ἐκ θανάτου μεταφωτισάντας.

^v Conc. Constant. sub Menna, an. 536, act. v. Conc. tom. v. p. 185, c. Μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ ἁγίου εὐαγγελίου, ἐξ Ἰθους τῆς θείας λειτουργίας ἐπιτελουμένης, καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κλειθεισῶν, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου μαθήματος κατὰ τὸ σύνθηες λεχθέντος, τῇ κατὰ τὴν διπτύχων μετὰ πολλῆς ἡσυχίας συνδραμεν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος κύκλῳ τοῦ θιοστατηρίου, καὶ ἡκρῶντο, καὶ ὡς μόνον ἐλίχθησαν αἱ προσηγοραὶ τῶν εἰρημίων ἁγίων τιςάων συνδῶν παρὰ τοῦ διακόνου, καὶ τῶν ἐν ἰσῆα τῇ μνήμῃ ἀρχιεπισκόπων, Εὐφρημίου, καὶ Μακιδονίου, καὶ Λιοντος, μεγάλῃ φωνῇ ἔκραξαν ἅπαντες, Δόξα σοι, Κύριε. καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο, μετὰ πάσης εὐταξίας ἐπληρώθη σὺν Θεῷ ἡ θία λειτουργία.

^x Schelstrat. de Conc. Antioch. p. 217. Ex hoc loco (Concilii Constantino-politani) insigne habemus testimonium, post evangelium finitum fuisse missam catechumenorum; tum clausis januis sanctam lectionem peractam, orationes utique cum præfatione et parte canonis; tumque a diacono in altari lecta esse diptycha, in quibus memoria erat episcoporum pie defunctorum; nec sola, sed etiam vivorum, qui dignitate aliqua excelebant, &c.

it ‘prayers and prefaces,’ which most certainly¹ signifies the *Creed* in this place): “Then, after the reading of the Creed, in the time of the diptychs, all the people ran and stood about the altar, with great silence, to give attention; and when the deacon had named the four holy synods, and the archbishops of blessed memory,—Euphemius, Macedonius, and Leo, they all, with a loud voice, cried out, ‘Glory be to thee, O Lord;’ and, after that, with great tranquillity, the Divine service was piously performed.” It is here observable, that the recital of the diptychs was before the consecration-prayer, as it is represented in the Hierarchy of Dionysius (though in the Latin Church it seems to have been otherwise), and that now it was usual to mention the four first general councils, to shew their approbation of them. Which may be also evidenced from one of Justinian’s letters to Epiphanius, bishop of Constantinople, now extant in the Code,² wherein he assures him, “That it was in vain for any one to trouble him upon any false hopes; as if he had done, or ever would do, or suffer any other to do, any thing contrary to the four councils; or allow the pious memory of them to be erased out of the diptychs of the Church.” These, therefore, were of use, partly to preserve the memory of such eminent men as were dead in the communion of the Church; and partly to make honourable mention of such general councils as had established the chief articles of the faith: and to erase the names either of men or councils out of these diptychs, was the same thing as to declare that they were heterodox, and such as they thought unworthy to hold communion with, as criminals, or some ways deviating from the faith. Upon this account, St. Cyprian ordered the name of Geminus Victor to be left out³ among those that were

¹ See this proved before, book x. chap. iii. sect. iii. vol. iii. p. 321.

² Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. i. n. vii. sect. v. Μηδὲς μάτην ἡμᾶς παραξάτω ἱλατὶ ματαίᾳ κρατούμενος, ὅτι ἡμῖς ἱκαντίον τῶν εἰρημίων δ. συνόδων ἐπαράξαμεν, ἢ ἐπαράξομεν, ἢ παρὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συγχωρήσομεν, ἢ περιαιρεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων δ. συνόδων ἰδίαν μνήμην ἐν τῶν εἰρημίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας διατύχων ἀνιξόμεθα.

—Vid. Evagr. lib. iv. cc. iv. et xi.

³ Cyprian. Epist. lxvi. al. i. ad Plebem Furnit. p. 170, edit. Fell. Amstelod. Neque enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece, qui ab altari sacerdotes et ministros voluit avocare.

commemorated at the holy table, because he had broken the rules of the Church. And Evagrius observes^b of Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, that his name was struck out of the holy books, that is, the diptychs, upon the account of his heretical opinions, after death. And St. Austin, speaking of Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, whom the Donatists falsely accused of being ordained by *traditores*, or ‘men who had delivered up the Bible to be burned in time of persecution,’ tells them,^c “That if they could make good any real charge against him, they would no longer name him among the rest of the bishops, whom they believed to be faithful and innocent, at the altar.”

SECT. XIX.—*Next to the Dead, Prayer made for the Living Members of that particular Church, and every Order in it.*

Having made this short digression concerning the diptychs of the Church, I now return to the order of the service laid down in the Constitutions:—where next after prayer for the dead, supplication is made for the living members of that particular Church then assembled, and every distinct order of persons in it.^d “We offer unto thee, for this people, that thou wouldst make them, to the glory of thy Christ, a royal priesthood and a holy nation; for all that live in virginity and chastity; for the widows of the Church; for all that live in honest marriage; for the infants of thy people; that none of us may be a castaway. We pray thee for this city, and all that dwell therein.” St. Austin likewise speaks of these prayers at the altar,^e for the faithful, that they, by the gift

^b Evagr. lib. iv. c. xxxviii. Ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπηλείψαι διέλτων, κ. τ. λ.

^c Aug. Sermon. xxxvii. ex editis a Sirmondo, tom. x. p. 840. Inventus sit prorsus reus: deinceps eum ad altare inter episcopos, quos fideles et innocentes credimus, non recitabimus. (v. 978, F.)

^d Constitut. lib. viii. c. xii. See sect. i. sub litt. (b). Adhuc offerimus tibi pro populo hoc, ut eum in laudem Christi tui exhibeas regale sacerdotium, gentem sanctam: pro iis, qui in virginitate et castitate vivunt; pro viduis ecclesiæ; pro iis, qui in nuptiis honestis, ac in progeneratione liberorum degunt; pro infantibus plebis tuæ; uti nostrum neminem rejiciendum habeas. Adhuc poscimus te pro urbe hac et habitantibus in ea.

^e Aug. Epist. cvii. ad Vitalem, (vol. ii. p. 608.) Exsere contra orationes ecclesiæ disputationes tuas; et quando audis sacerdotem Dei ad altare exhortantem

of God, may persevere in that wherein they have begun. Again,^f “Who ever heard the priest praying over the faithful, and saying, ‘Grant, O Lord, that they may persevere in thee unto the end,’ and durst, either in word or thought, reprehend that prayer, and not rather answer ‘Amen,’ to such a benediction?” Chrysostom, in like manner, describing the bishop’s office, says,^g “It is his business to pray for a whole city; and not for a whole city only, but, as an ambassador, for the whole world, that God would be propitious and merciful both to the sins of the living and the dead.” Which makes it the more probable, that the prayers of the like kind that occur in St. Chrysostom’s Liturgy,^h are but a copy of such prayers as were then commonly used in the ancient Church.

SECT. XX.—*For those that are in Sickness, Slavery, Banishment, and Proscription, and that travel by Sea or by Land.*

The next petition in the Constitutions is for all that are in affliction, whether by sickness, or slavery, or banishment, or confiscation, and proscription; and for all that are exposed to any perils upon the account of their necessary travels by sea or by land. Of these petitions I find no particular mention made in other writers, save only in Cyril of Jerusalem, who says,ⁱ “After they had prayed for the

populum Dei, orare pro incredulis, ut eos Deus convertat ad fidem, et pro catechumenis, ut eis desiderium regenerationis inspiret, et pro fidelibus ut in eo quod esse cœperunt, ejus munere perseverent, subsanna pias voces, et dic te non facere quod hortatur, &c.

^f Aug. de Dono Perseverantiæ, c. xxiii. (vol. x. p. 566, A.) Quis sacerdotem super fideles Dominum invocantem, si quando dixit, ‘Da illis, Domine, in te perseverare usque in finem; non solum voce ausus est, sed saltem cogitatione reprehendere; ac non potius super ejus talem benedictionem, et corde credente,’ et ore confitente respondit, ‘Amen.’

^g Chrysostom. de Sacerdot. lib. vi. c. iv. p. 93. See sect. xiii. note (^a), p. 102.

^h Ibid. Liturg. tom. iii. p. 616, (tom. iv. p. 542, edit. Francof.) Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ποίμενός ἡμῶν ταύτης, ἐν ᾗ παρεικοῦμεν, καὶ πάσης πόλεως, καὶ χώρας, καὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει οἰκούντων ἐν αὐταῖς, &c. &c.

ⁱ Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. sect. vi. Ὡς τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ὑπὲρ τῶν καταπονυμένων, καὶ ἀπαξασπλῶς, ὑπὲρ πάντων βεηθείας διαμένων διόμιθά σου πάντες ἡμῖς· εἴτα μνημονόομεν, καὶ τῶν προκοιμημένων, &c. &c.

common peace of the Church, and the tranquillity of the world, for kings; and for their armies and allies: they also besought God for all that were sick and afflicted, or in any kind of want: and, last of all, they prayed for the dead." By which we may judge, that though the order of the petitions was a little varied in the liturgies of different Churches, yet the substance was the same. And there is little question but the sick and distressed were remembered in these prayers in all the Churches; since in the deacon's bidding-prayer before the oblation, there is express direction given to the people, to pray for the sick, and those that travel by sea or by land, and those that are in the mines, in banishment, in prison, in bonds, and in slavery, as I have shewed out of several passages in St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Austin, comparing them with the form of bidding-prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church in the Constitutions, related before in the first chapter of this Book, § ii. and iii.

SECT. XXI. — *For Enemies and Persecutors, Heretics and Unbelievers.*

The next petition in the Constitutions is for their enemies and persecutors, for heretics and unbelievers, those that are without the pale of the Church, and wandering in error; that God would convert them to good, and mitigate their fury. And of this there are frequent examples in the writings of the ancients. For nothing was more strictly observed by the ancients than to pray for their enemies and persecutors, for Jews, infidels, and heretics; of which Dr. Cave^k has given several instances out of Cyprian,^l

^k Cave's Primitive Christianity, part iii. chap. ii. p. 249. (London, 1673, p. 242.)

^l Passio Cyprian. vit. ejus annex. (p. 12, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Nullos alios Deos novi, nisi unum et verum Deum, qui fecit cælum, et terram, et mare, et quæ in eis sunt omnia. Huic Deo nos Christiani deservimus; hunc deprecamur, diebus ac noctibus, pro nobis, et pro omnibus hominibus, et pro incolumitate ipsorum Imperatorum.

Justin Martyr,^m and Irenæus.ⁿ Which because they may seem only to refer to their private prayers, I will add a few more which more expressly relate to their public devotions. Tertullian tells the heathen,^o “They were taught by the Scriptures (which they themselves might read) to exhibit a more than ordinary kindness toward men, in praying to God for their enemies, and wishing all good to their persecutors. For they had no greater enemies or persecutors, in those days, than those very emperors for whom they made supplications to God,^p as oft as they met in public; and for their officers; and for the state of the world; and for the peace and tranquillity of their affairs; and for the duration of their empire.” Arnobius says,^q “Their churches were oratories, wherein they prayed for peace and pardon: for the magistrates and princes; for their armies; for their friends, and for their enemies.” St. Austin particularly notes,^r “That the priest was wont to exhort the people at the altar to pray for unbelievers, that God would convert them to the faith.” And,

^m Justin. Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 254. Ὡς τὴν ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἰχθυοειδῶν ἡμῶν ὑποχρίμεθα. — P. 323, fin. Ἐνχοίμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἵνα ἰληθῇτε ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. — P. 363. Ἀδιαλείστως κατακρῦσθαι αὐτῇ τι ἰκίονα καὶ τοῖς ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, πάντων ἡμῶν ὑποχρίμενοι ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπλῶς ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰδιόαχθῆμεν.

ⁿ Iren. lib. iii. c. xlvii. Nos precamur non perseverare eos in fovea, quam ipsi foderunt, sed segregari ab hujusmodi matre . . . et legitime eos generari, conversos ad ecclesiam Dei, &c. (Oxon. 1702, p. 270.)

^o Tertul. Apol. c. xxxi. (p. 27, Paris. 1664.) Qui putaveris nihil nos de salute Cæsarum curare, inspicere Dei voces, literas nostras: scitote ex illis præceptum esse nobis, ad redundantiam benignitatis, etiam pro inimicis Deum orare, et persecutoribus nostris bona precari. Qui magis inimici et persecutores Christianorum, quam de quorum majestate convenimur in crimen? Sed etiam nominatim atque manifeste, ‘Orate,’ inquit, ‘pro regibus, pro principibus, et potestatibus, ut omnia tranquilla sint.’

^p Ibid. c. xxxix. (p. 31, A.) Coimus ad Deum, quasi manu facta precationibus ambiamus. Hæc vis Deo grata est. Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum, ac potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis.

^q Arnob. lib. iv. p. 181. Cur immaniter conventicula nostra dirui meruerunt? In quibus summus oratur Deus; pax cunctis et venia postulatur magistratibus, exercitibus, regibus, familiaribus, inimicis, &c.

^r Aug. Epist. cvii. ad Vitalem. Audis sacerdotem Dei ad altare exhortantem populum Dei, orare pro incredulis, ut eos Deus convertat ad fidem.

again,^a “When does not the Church pray for infidels and her enemies, that they may believe?” In like manner, Pope Celestine says,^t “The whole Church prayed with the priest for infidels, that faith might be given unto them; for idolaters, that they might be delivered from the errors of their impiety; for Jews, that the veil being taken away from their heart, the light of truth may appear unto them; for heretics, that they may repent, by returning to the Catholic faith; for schismatics, that they may receive the spirit of charity, reviving from the dead.” And the same is repeated by Gennadius,^u or whoever was the author of the book *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, under the name of St. Austin. And, in both places, it is said, that this practice was derived from the apostles, and uniformly observed in the whole Catholic Church throughout the world. Nay, it is evident they prayed for many heretics, whom they looked upon as guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost. For they did not esteem that sin absolutely unpardonable, but only punishable in both worlds, on supposition that men did not repent of it. Therefore St. Austin and others say,^w “They prayed that they might repent and be saved; and accordingly admitted them to the peace and communion of the Church, upon their repentance.” In a word, as Chrysostom says,^x “They prayed for the whole world, without exception; they prayed that all men whatsoever might be converted.”

^a Aug. de Dono Perseverantiæ, c. xxiii. Quando non oratum est in ecclesia pro infidelibus atque inimicis ejus, ut crederent?

^t Cælestin. Epist. i. ad Gallos, c. ii. (Not. apud Labbeum, ubi tom. ii. Conc. p. 1611, hæc epistola exstat, hæc non invenio.—Grischov.) Sanctarum plebium præsules, tota secum ecclesia congemiscente, postulant et precantur, ut infidelibus donetur fides; ut idololatræ ab impietatis suæ liberentur errore; ut Judæis, ablato cordis velamine, lux veritatis appareat; ut hæretici Catholicæ fidei perceptione resipiscant; ut schismatici spiritum redivivæ caritatis accipiant, &c.

^u Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. xxx. inter Opera Aug. tom. iii. p. 200, edit. Basil. 1569.

^w Retract. lib. i. c. xix. De quocumque pessimo, in hac vita constituto, non est utique desperandum: nec pro illo imprudenter oratur, de quo non desperatur.

^x Chrysostom. Hom. vi. in 1 Tim. p. 1550, (p. 440, edit. Francof.) Ἰσασιν οἱ μύσται, πῶς καὶ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν γίνονται, καὶ ἐν ἰσότητι, καὶ ἐν πρωΐᾳ· πῶς ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ βασιλείων, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπερχῇ ὄντων ποιούμεθα τὴν δέησιν.

SECT. XXII. — *For the Catechumens, Energumens, and Penitents.*

Next, after heretics and unbelievers, prayer is made in the Constitutions for the catechumens of the Church, that God would perfect them in the faith; for the energumens, that were vexed with evil spirits, that God would cleanse and deliver them from the power and agitation of the wicked one; and for the penitents, that God would accept their repentance, and pardon both them and the whole church whatever offences they had committed against him. Whence we may observe, that these several orders were three distinct times prayed for in Divine service; first, in the prayers that were said for them in their presence, in the first service, called ‘the service of the catechumens;’ secondly, in the deacon’s bidding-prayer, for the whole state of the Church, before the oblation; and now again, thirdly, after the oblation, when all orders of men were prayed for at the sacrifice of the altar. This last is particularly noted by St. Austin,[†] who says, “The priest, at the altar, was used to exhort the people to pray for the catechumens, that God would inspire them with a desire of regeneration. And so it is said by Celestine* and Gennadius* in the same words, that they prayed for the lapsers, that God would grant them the remedy of repentance; and for the catechumens, that God would bring them to the sacrament of baptism, and open to them the great treasure of his heavenly mercy.

SECT. XXIII. — *For healthful and fruitful Seasons.*

In the next place, they prayed for health and provision; for the temperature of the air, and the increase of the fruits of the earth, as the Constitutions word it; that they, participating of the good things which God bestows upon men,

[†] Aug. Epist. cvii. ad Vitalem. Audis sacerdotem Dei ad altare exhortantem populum Dei orare pro incredulis ut eos Deus convertat ad fidem, et pro catechumenis ut eis desiderium regenerationis inspiret. (Vol. ii. p. 68.)

* Cælestin. Epist. i. ad Gallos, c. ii. Postulant et precantur, ut lapsis penitentiae remedia conferantur; ut denique, catechumenis ad regenerationis sacramenta perductis, cœlestis misericordiae aula reseretur,

* Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. xxx.

might, without ceasing, praise him, who giveth food to all flesh. St. Chrysostom, among other particulars of this prayer, notes the same,^b when he says, they prayed “for the earth and sea, for the air, and for the whole world.” And though Tertullian does not particularly speak of this prayer, yet he intimates, in general, that they were used to pray for temporal blessings, and among these for rain; as in the German expedition of Marcus Aurelius, when his army was saved from perishing, for want of water, by the prayers of the Christians, which never failed^c to drive away drought upon other occasions. The like observation is made by Cyprian,^d “That they offered continually supplications and prayers, night and day, for victory over their enemies; for obtaining rain; for averting or moderating all adversities; and for the peace and safety of the public.” Which being their continual prayer night and day, it is not to be doubted but that it was part of those prayers which they now more solemnly offered at the altar.

SECT. XXIV.—*For all their absent Brethren.*

The last petition, mentioned in the Constitutions, is for all those that, upon just and reasonable cause, were then absent from the assembly, that God would preserve both the absent and present in godliness, and keep them without change, blame, or rebuke; and finally gather them all into the kingdom of his Christ, the universal King, and God of all things in nature, both visible and invisible. The like petition is mentioned by Chrysostom, in one of his homilies upon St. Matthew,^e according to the old translation of Ani-

^b Chrysostom. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 745, (p. 521, edit. Francof.) ἵνα καὶ θαλάσσης, ὕδατος αἵματος, ὕδατος τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης, κλινομένης προσέσται ὁ φιλανθρώπων Θεός.

^c Tertul. ad Scapul. c. iv. (p. 71, B.) Marcus Aurelius, in Germanica expeditione, Christianorum militum orationibus ad Deum factis, imbres in siti illa impetravit. Quando non geniculationibus et jejunationibus nostris etiam siccitates sunt depulsæ?

^d Cyprian. ad Demetr. p. 193, (p. 134, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Pro arcendis hostibus, et imbris impetrandis, et vel auferendis vel temperandis adversis, rogamus semper et preces fundimus: et pro pace ac salute vestra propitiantes ac placantes Deum, diebus ac noctibus jugiter atque instantanter oramus.

^e Chrysostom. Hom. xxvi. in Matth. p. 259, (p. 315, edit. Francof.) Ὁ ἰσχυρὸς

anus: "The priest," says he, "when he stands at the altar, bids us give thanks for the whole world; for those that are absent and those that are present; for those that are gone before us and those that shall be after us, while the sacrifice lies upon the altar."

SECT. XXV.—*Concluding with a Doxology to the whole Trinity.*

The conclusion of this long prayer in the Constitutions is a doxology to the whole Trinity; and this was, of old, the constant custom of the Church, as is evident from what has been largely discoursed before,^f both concerning the adoration of the whole Trinity, as the true and only object of Divine worship, and also concerning the use of Divine hymns and doxologies to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; of which I need say no more in this place, to confirm the order laid down in the Constitutions, save only to observe, that two of the most ancient writers we have, Irenæus and Tertullian,^g do both mention one part of this doxology, as particularly used at the consecration of the eucharist. Irenæus says, "The Valentinians made it an argument for their Æones, that the Catholics used to say *εἰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων* in their eucharistical service: referring to the last words of this doxology, "World without end." And Tertullian particularly asks those who frequent the Roman games, "How they could give testimony to a gladiator, with that mouth wherewith they had answered 'Amen' at the eucharist? or say, 'World without end,' to any other but Christ their God?" Implying, that the glorification of Christ with this doxology was then a noted close of the consecration-prayer, as the author of the Constitutions represents it.

ὡς τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὡς τῶν νῦν, ὡς τῶν γεννηθέντων τῶν ἔμπροσθεν, ὡς τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἱσχυμένων εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὑπερεξουσίᾳ κυρίου τῆς θουσίας προκυμένης ἐκείνης.

^f Book xiii. chap. ii. — Book xiv. chap. ii. sect. i.

^g Iren. lib. i. c. v. p. 16. 'Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπερεξουσίας λέγοντας, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἐκείνους τοὺς αἰῶνας σημαίνουσιν. — Tertul. de Spectac. c. xxv. p. 83, C. 2. Quale est . . . ex ore, quo 'Amen' in sanctum protuleris, gladiatorum testimonium reddere, Εἰς αἰῶνας ἂν αἰῶνες alii omnino dicere, nisi Deo et Christo? — Vid. Chrysostom. Hom. xxxv. in 1 Cor. sub litt. (I), p. 135.

SECT. XXVI.—*To which the People, with one Voice,
answered “Amen.”*

And from this passage of Tertullian it is no less apparent, that the people were used to subjoin their ‘Amen’ to the end of this prayer, which was a custom as ancient as the apostles; for St. Paul seems plainly to allude to it, 1 Cor. xiv. 16: “When thou shalt bless with the Spirit [that is, bless the cup of blessing, or the eucharist], in an unknown tongue, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say ‘Amen’ at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?” Justin Martyr,^h in describing the Christian rites in celebrating the eucharist, takes notice of this among the rest; that, when the president had ended his prayers and thanksgivings over the bread and wine, all the people assented with their acclamations, saying, “Amen.” And Dionysius of Alexandria,ⁱ speaking of one who had never been truly baptized, but had often, notwithstanding, been partaker of the eucharist, says, “They would not rebaptize him, because he had for a long time heard the thanksgiving, and joined with the people in the common ‘Amen.’” And so Chrysostom, interpreting those words of the apostle, “How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say ‘Amen’ at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest;” plainly refers to this custom: for, he says, *ιδιώτης*, which we render ‘unlearned,’ signifies ‘a private man,’ or ‘layman.’ “And if thou blessest in an unknown tongue,^j not understanding what thou sayest, nor being able to interpret it, the layman cannot answer, ‘Amen;’ for he, not hearing

^h Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97. Οἱ συντελίσαντες τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐφ’ ἑαυτῶν λέγων, Ἀμήν.

ⁱ Ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. ix. Εὐχαριστίας ἱσακούσαντα, καὶ συνεισφθεγγόμενον, τὸ Ἀμήν, . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνασκευάζειν ἴτι τολμήσαιμι.

^j Chrysostom. Hom. xxxv. in 1 Cor. p. 640, (p. 389, edit. Francof.) Ἰδιώτην τὸν λαϊκὸν λέγουσι, καὶ δίδνουσι καὶ αὐτὸν οὐ μικρὰν ὑπομένοντα τὴν ζημίαν, ὅταν τὸ Ἀμήν ἰστίῃ μὴ δύνηται· ὃ δὲ λέγουσι τοῦτο ἴσθιν· ἂν εὐλογῆσιν τῇ τῶν βαρβάρων φωνῇ, οὐκ ἰδὼς τί λέγουσι, οὐδὲ ἡρμηνεύσαι δυνάμενοι, οὐ δύναται ὑποφωνῆσαι τὸ Ἀμήν· ὁ λαϊκὸς· οὐ γὰρ ἀκούων τὸ, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ὅπερ ἰστί· τίλος, οὐ λέγουσι τὸ Ἀμήν.

those words, 'World without end,' which is the close of the thanksgiving, cannot say 'Amen.'" Where we may observe, both that the consecration-prayer ended with a known doxology to the Holy Trinity, whereof those words, "World without end," were a part; and that the people, hearing them, answered, "Amen."

SECT. XXVII.—*Then followed the Creed, in such Churches as had made it a Part of their Liturgy.*

There is no mention made in the Constitutions of the formal rehearsing either of the Creed or the Lord's Prayer, in this place, immediately after consecration; and the reason is, that when that author made his Collections, it was not yet become the custom to use the Creed in any other service, but only that of baptism, in any church whatsoever. The first that brought the rehearsing of the Creed into the liturgy was Peter Fullo, bishop of Antioch, about the year 471; and after that, about the year 511, Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople, brought it into use in the liturgy of that Church, as we learn from the history of Theodorus Lector.^k After that we find it mentioned in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas (an. 536), as being rehearsed,^l according to custom, between the reading of the Gospel and the diptychs. After this, about the year 589, it was brought into the Spanish Church at the petition of King Reccaredus, by the order of the third Council of Toledo, and that after the example of the Eastern Churches; and then it was ordered to be said,^m with a loud voice, after the consecration,

^k Theod. Lect. p. 563. Τιμόθεος τὸ τῶν ἑρμανοσίων δόξα καὶ ἐκτῶ πατρίων τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον, καὶ ἐκείνην σύναξιν λέγεσθαι παρισυνήκασιν. — P. 566. Πίστεον φησι τὸν Κραφία . . . ἐν πάσῃ συνάξει τὸ σύμβολον λέγεσθαι.

^l Conc. Constant. sub Menna, act. i. p. 41, edit. Crab. (quæ est act. v. edit. Labb. tom. v. p. 185, c.) cit. supra, sect. xviii. sub litt. (▼), p. 125.

^m Conc. Tolet. III. c. ii. (tom. v. Conc. p. 1009.) Consultu piissimi et gloriosissimi Domini nostri Reccaredi regis, sancta constituit synodus, ut per omnes ecclesias Hispaniæ, et Galli(æ)ciæ, secundum formam Orientalium ecclesiarum Concilii Constantinopolitani, hoc est, centum quinquaginta episcoporum, symbolum fidei recitetur; ut prius quam Dominica dicatur Oratio, voce clara prædicetur, quo et fides vera manifestum testimonium habeat, et ad Christi corpus et sanguinem prælibandum pectora populorum (nuper ex Ariana hæresi conversorum) fide purificata accedant.

immediately before the Lord's Prayer, to be an instruction, and declaration of the people's true faith, who were lately converted from Arianism, and to prepare their hearts, thus purified by faith, to the following reception of the body and blood of Christ. It was not thus used in the Gallican Liturgy till the time of Charles the Great; nor in the Roman Liturgy till the beginning of the eleventh century; as I have more fully shewed in a former Book.^a But as it had earlier admittance in the Spanish Churches, so the rehearsal of it appears to have been appropriated to the time after consecration, between that and the Lord's Prayer, which, in most Churches, they were used to repeat also toward the conclusion of these prayers, following the oblation.

SECT. XXVIII. — *And the Lord's Prayer.*

For though there be no mention made of the Lord's Prayer in this part of the service in the Constitutions (as, probably, not in use in that Church whence the author made his collections), yet we are assured it was almost generally used in all Churches. For not only the fore-mentioned Council of Toledo, and the fourth of the same name,^o speak of the Lord's Prayer as coming before the reception of the bread and wine in the Spanish Churches; but St. Austin says,^p the whole Church almost concluded the oblation-prayers with it. And I have already^q confirmed his observation from several other passages of St. Chrysostom, and Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Jerom, and Gregory the Great; who was also of opinion, that the apostles used no other prayer to consecrate the eucharist^r but the Lord's Prayer, in

^a Book x. chap. iv. sect xvii.

^o Conc. Tolet. IV. c. xviii. (tom. v. Conc. p. 1711.) Nonnulli sacerdotes post dictam Orationem Dominicam statim communicant, et postea benedictionem in populo dant: quod deinceps interdicimus: sed post Orationem Dominicam, et conjunctionem panis ac calicis, benedictio in populum sequatur, et tunc demum corporis ac sanguinis Domini sacramentum sumatur.

^p Aug. Ep. lix.

^q See those cited at large, Book xiii. chap. vii. sect. iii.

^r Gregor. lib. vii. ep. lxiv. Orationem Dominicam idecirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent.

which he was something singular ; for there is little question, but that the apostles consecrated, as the Lord had done before them. As to the practice of the Church in using the Lord's Prayer at this time, Optatus says,¹ " It was become so customary by necessary prescript, that the Donatists themselves did not pretend to omit it." And, in some of the French Councils,² an order was made, that no layman, even of those that did not communicate, should leave the assembly before the Lord's Prayer was said.

SECT. XXIX.—*Absolution of Penitents immediately before the Lord's Prayer, with occasional Benedictions.*

It appears from the last mentioned place of Optatus, that when any penitents were to receive a solemn absolution in the African Church, it was usually given them about this time, between the offering of the oblation and the Lord's Prayer. For he tells the Donatists,³ " That the very moment after they had given penitents imposition of hands, and pardon of sins, they were obliged to turn to the altar, and say the Lord's Prayer." Which implies that absolution was commonly given at this season. And here we may suppose several of those prayers of thanksgiving or benediction, mentioned in the seventh and eighth books of the Constitutions, to have had their place ; such as the benediction of the holy oil, and the thanksgiving for the first-fruits of the earth :⁴ there being no time more proper for such things, than the time of the oblation. But as nothing is said positively and expressly of this matter, I only mention it by way of conjecture.

¹ Optat. lib. ii. p. 57. See following note, (").

² Conc. Aurel. III. c. xxviii. De missis nullus laicorum ante discedat, quam Dominica dicatur Oratio, &c. See following note, (").

³ Optat. lib. ii. p. 57, (p. 52, edit. Paris. 1679.) Inter vicina momenta, dum manus imponitis et delicta donatis, mox ad altare conversi, Dominicam Orationem præmittere non potestis.

⁴ Constitut. lib. vii. c. xlii. tot. ; et lib. viii. c. xl. tot.

SECT. XXX.—*Benediction after the Lord's Prayer.*

But there is more evidence of another sort of benediction following the Lord's Prayer, in many of the Western Churches. For the third Council of Orleans[▼] had a canon which orders all laymen to stay till they had heard the Lord's Prayer, and received the bishop's benediction. Cardinal Bona^{*} understands this of the final benediction, which followed the communion; but Mabillon more truly interprets it of the benediction before communion,^{**} immediately following the Lord's Prayer. Concerning which there is a canon in the Council of Toledo,[†] which censures some priests for communicating immediately after the Lord's Prayer, without giving the benediction to the people; and orders, "That for the future, the benediction should follow the Lord's Prayer, and after that the communion." And by this we are to interpret some other canons of the Councils of Agde and Orleans,[‡] which order the people not to depart till the bishop has given his benediction. Which is to be understood of the benediction before the communion, and not that which came after it. And this agrees with the order in the Constitutions; where, after the long prayer of

▼ Conc. Aurel. III. c. xxviii. De missis nullus laicorum ante discedat, quam Dominica dicatur Oratio; et si episcopus fuerit præsens, ejus benedictio expectetur.

* Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xvi. sect. ii.

** Mabil. de Liturgic. lib. i. c. iv. sect. xiv. (p. 35.) 'De missis nullus laicorum,' &c. Walafridus id interpretatur de oratione, quæ post communionem dicitur. At repugnant verba Concilii Toletani, aliorumque. In Missali Mozarabico benedictio ubique communioni præmittitur, itemque in Gallicano passim apud Thomasium: et hactenus benedictio episcopalis ante communionem datur. Quippe licebat iis, qui non communicabant, accepta benedictione ante communionem discedere, ut ex prædictis locis intelligitur, &c.

† Conc. Tolet. IV. c. xvii. Nonnulli sacerdotes post dictam Orationem Dominicam statim communicant, et postea benedictionem in populo dant: quod deinceps interdiximus: sed post Orationem Dominicam benedictio in populum sequatur, et tunc demum corporis et sanguinis Domini sacramentum sumatur.

‡ Conc. Agath. c. xlvii. Missas die Dominico a sæcularibus totas teneri speciali ordinatione præcipimus: ita ut ante benedictionem sacerdotis egredi populus non præsumat. — Conc. Aurel. III. c. xxviii. De missis nullus laicorum, &c. See above, note (*).

the consecration and oblation is ended,^a the bishop is appointed to give this short benediction, "The peace of God be with you all:" and then, after the deacon has rehearsed a bidding-prayer (much to the same purpose with the former, for the whole Church, and every order in it, and particularly for the sacrifice then offered, that God would receive it to his altar in heaven for a sweet-smelling savour, by the mediation of Christ), the bishop again recommends the people to God in another prayer, which the Greeks call *παράθεσις*, and the Latins, *commendatio* and *benedictio*, the 'commendation,' or 'benediction,' beseeching God to sanctify their bodies and souls, and to make them worthy of the good things he has set before them; which relates both to their worthy reception of the eucharist, and their obtaining eternal life. This is what I conceive those Latin Councils call the 'bishop's benediction,' of which there are some instances in the Mozarabic Liturgy, and many more in the old Gothic and Gallican Missals lately published by Mabillon; where the prayer that follows the Collect after the Lord's Prayer, is always styled *benedictio populi*, 'the benediction of the people:' and these are commonly different prayers, composed with some respect to the several festivals to which they were appropriated; like the collects before the Epistles and Gospels in our present liturgy. But I return to the ancient service.

SECT. XXXI. — *Of the Deacon's Bidding-Prayer after the Consecration.*

There is one petition in the deacon's bidding-prayer after the consecration in the Constitutions, which is not to be passed over in silence; that is, "That God would receive the gift that was then offered to him, to his altar in heaven, as a sweet-smelling savour, by the mediation of his Christ." This

^a Constitut. lib. viii. c. xliii. "Ἐπὶ καὶ ἰτε διηβώμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὑπὲρ τοῦ δώρου τοῦ προσκομισθέντος Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ, ἵνα ὡς ὁ ἀγαθὸς Θεὸς προσδέξηται αὐτὸ διὰ τῆς μεσιτείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱεραγεῖον αὐτοῦ θυσιαστήριον, εἰς ὁμὴν ἰουδαίας.

form seems as ancient as Irenæus; for he says,^b “We have an altar in heaven, and thither our prayers and oblations are directed.” And so it is in all the Greek liturgies, with a small variation. And frequently in the Mozarabic Liturgy,^c and the old Gothic Missal, published by Mabillon,^d there are prayers for the descent of the Holy Ghost to sanctify the gifts, and make them the body and blood of Christ, even after the repetition of the words, “This is my body,” and “This is my blood;” which evidently shews, that the ancient formers of the liturgy did not think the consecration to be effected by the bare repetition of those words, but by prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elements of bread and wine. And it is very remarkable, that even in the present canon of the Roman Mass, there is still such a prayer as this remaining after what they call ‘consecration:’

^b Iren. lib. iv. c. xxxiv. Est altare in cœlis; illuc preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur.

^c Missa Mozarab. in Natali Domini, (ap. Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xiii. sect. v. p. 569.) In altare tuum panis ac vini holocausta proponimus, rogantes, ut has hostias Trinitas indivisa sanctificet. — Id. Domin. ii. post octav. Epiphan. Quæsumus, ut oblationem hanc Spiritus tui permixtione sanctifices, et corpus ac sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi plena transformatione conformes. — Id. Domin. v. post Epiph. (ibid.) Ut has hostias intendas propitius, sanctifices, et benedicas. — Id. Domin. i. Quadragesimæ: Emitte Spiritum tuum de sanctis cœlis tuis, quo sanctificentur oblata. — Id. Domin. iii. Digneris hæc oblata sanctificare. — In die Paschatis: Ut hic panis cum hoc calice in Filii tui corpus ac sanguinem te benedicente ditiescat. — Id. Domin. iii. post Pascha; His sacrificiis propitiatus illabere, hisque benedicturus descende.

^d Missal. Gothic. ap. Mabillon. lib. iii. p. 214, in Festo Adsumtionis. Descendat, Domine, in his sacrificiis tuæ benedictionis coæternus et cooperator Paracletus Spiritus: ut oblationem, quam tibi de tua terra fructificante porrigimus, cœlesti permutatione, te sanctificante, sumamus; ut translata fruge in corpore, calice in cruore, proficiat meritis, quod obtulimus pro delictis, &c. — Id. Missa in Circumcisione, ibid. p. 202. Hoc sacrificium suscipere et benedicere et sanctificare digneris, ut fiat nobis eucharistia legitima, &c. — Id. Missa xx. in Cathedra Petri, p. 228. Immittere digneris Spiritum tuum Sanctum super hæc solemnia: ut fiat nobis legitima eucharistia in tuo, Filiique tui nomine, et Spiritus Sancti, &c. Et Missa lxy. in Festo Leudegarii, p. 285. Descendat heic benedictio tua super hunc panem et calicem in transformatione Spiritus tui Sancti; uti hæc benedicendo benedicas, sanctificando sanctifices, &c. Missa lxxvii. Dominicalis, p. 296. Per quem (Jesum Christum) te, Pater omnipotens, deprecamur: ut supraposita altario tuo munera lætus adspicias: atque hæc omnia obumbræs Sancti Filii tui Spiritu: ut quod ex hac tua benedictione acceperimus, æternitatis gloria consequamur.

the priest, offering the host, says,^e “Be pleased to look upon these things with a favourable and propitious eye, as thou wert pleased to accept the gifts of Abel, thy righteous servant.” He adds, “We beseech thee, Almighty God, to command that these things may be carried by the hands of thy holy angels to thy altar on high.” Concluding, “By Christ our Lord, by whom thou dost always create, sanctify, quicken, and bless these good things unto us.” These words in this prayer, as our polemical writers have rightly observed,^f were used before transubstantiation was invented, and when the consecration was thought to be made by prayer, and not barely by pronouncing the words, “This is my body.” And then they were good sense, when they were said over bread and wine, to consecrate them into the memorial and symbols of Christ’s body and blood. But now they are become absurd, and contrary to the primitive intention. For how can the real body and blood of Christ be called these gifts? or be compared to the sacrifice of Abel, who offered a beast? How can men pray (without indignity to the Son of God) that the sacrifice of God’s only Son may be as acceptable to God as the sacrifice of Abel was? Or how does Christ, who sits at the right hand of the Father, need the mediation of angels to be carried or presented to his Father at the heavenly altar? With what propriety of speech can Christ be called, “All these good things?” and “The good things which God createth always, and quickeneth, and sanctifieth always?” Doth God create, and quicken, and bless Jesus Christ by Jesus Christ? It is proper to say all this of the gifts, supposing them still to be real bread and wine; but altogether improper, if they are transubstantiated into the natural flesh and blood of Christ. Whence we may conclude, that the first compilers of this prayer knew nothing

^e Missal. Roman. in Canone Missæ, p. 300, Autuerp. 1574. *Supra hæc propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris, ut accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui jussi Abel. . . . Supplices te rogamus, Deus Omnipotens, jube hæc perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum. . . . Per Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem, Domine, hæc omnia semper nobis bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedidis.*

^f Vid. Du Moulin, *Novelty of Popery*, chap. v. p. 730; and Buckler of Faith, p. 510.

of the new doctrine of transubstantiation, which makes his prayer absurd in every syllable of it; to enter here no further upon a debate concerning the change which is made in the elements by consecration, which every one knows where to find discussed at large in our polemical writers; and something will be said of it hereafter,^s under the head of adoration.

SECT. XXXII.—*Of the Form Sancta Sanctis, and the Hymn
“Glory be to God on High.”*

Immediately after the benediction of the bishop, the deacon, in the Constitutions, is appointed to say, *Πρόσχωμεν*, ‘Let us give attention.’ And then the bishop, calling to the people, says, “*Ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις*, ‘Holy things for those that are holy.’ To which the people answer, “There is one Holy, one Lord, one Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father, who is blessed for ever, Amen. Glory be to God in the highest; and on earth peace, good-will towards men. Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed be God the Lord, that came in the name of the Lord, and appeared unto us; Hosanna in the highest.” Cyril of Jerusalem takes notice of one part of this in the Church of Jerusalem, where it came immediately after the Lord’s Prayer. “After that,” says he,^b “the priest says, ‘Holy things for holy men.’ Holy are the elements which lie before us, when they have received the illapse of the Holy Ghost upon them. Holy are ye also, when ye are endowed with the Holy Ghost: and, therefore, holy things agree to holy men. Then ye say ‘There is one holy, one Lord Jesus Christ.’ There is one truly holy, who is holy by nature: ye also are holy, not by nature, but by participation, by exercise, and prayer.” St. Chrysostom also takes notice of the same, comparing the service of the Church to the Olympic exercises,ⁱ “Where

^s Chap. v. sect. iv.

^b Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. p. 545. Μετὰ ταῦτα λίγου ὁ ἱερεὺς, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις ἅγια τὰ προεσθίμενα, ἱπιφοίτησιν διζήμενα ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἅγιοι καὶ ὑμεῖς, Πνεύματος ἁγίου καταξιοθίντες· τὰ ἅγια οὖν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατάλληλα· ὅσα ὑμεῖς λίγισι, Εἰς ἅγιος, εἰς Κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός· ἀληθῶς γὰρ εἰς ἅγιος, φύσει ἅγιος ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ ἅγιοι, ἀλλ’ οὐ φύσει, ἀλλὰ μετοσχῇ, καὶ σπῆσει, καὶ ἐύχῃ.

ⁱ Chrysostom. Hom. xvii. in Hebr. p. 1873, (p. 848, edit. Francof.)

the herald stands and cries with a loud voice, 'Does any one accuse this man? Is he a thief? Is he a slave? Is he an immoral man?' So the ecclesiastical herald, the priest, standing on high, calls some, and reject others, not with his hand, but with his tongue: for when he says, 'Holy things for holy men,' he says this, 'If any one be not holy, let him not come here.' He does not barely say, 'If he be free from sin,' but 'If he be holy:' for it does not make a man holy, merely to be free from sin, but to be endowed with the Spirit, and to abound with good works. 'Therefore,' he says, 'I would not have you only free from mire, but white and beautiful.'" St. Chrysostom also often speaks of the hymn "Glory be to God on high;" and tells us particularly that it was sung at the eucharist, as well as upon other occasions. "God," says he,¹ "first brought the angels down hither, and then carried men up to them. The earth was

Ἔσται τοίνυν καὶ νῦν ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν κήρυξ, οὗ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἵκαστον κατήχων, καὶ παραγῶν, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἰμοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς τῆς Ἰνδοῦ κατήχων, οὐκ ἰφίστησιν ἄλλους αὐτοῖς κατηγόρους, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ λίγυ, Μὴ τις τούτου κατηγορεῖ; ἀλλὰ τί; Εἴ τις ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορεῖ; ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃ, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, τοῦτο λίγυ, Εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος, μὴ προσέτω. οὐχ ἀπλῶς, φησιν, ἁμαρτημάτων καθαροὺς, ἀλλ' ἁγίους· τὸν γὰρ ἅγιον οὐχ ἡ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπαλλαγὴ ποιεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος παρουσία, καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀγαθῶν πλεονότης. οὐ βούλει μόνον, φησὶ, βοεῶντος ἀπηλλάχθαι ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ λιουκοὺς εἶναι, καὶ ἀραίους. — Vid. etiam Hom. cxliiii. tom. v. pp. 809, 810, edit. Savil. Τούτου χάριν ὑψηλὸς ἰσθὺς ὁ ἱερεὺς, μεγάλην τῇ φωνῇ, φρικτὴν τῇ βοῇ, καθάπερ τις κήρυξ, τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων εἰς ὕψος, πᾶσι κατὰ δὴλος γιγνώσκων, καὶ μίγα ἰπ' ἐκείνῃ τῇ φρικτῇ ἡσυχίᾳ ἀνακράζων, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, τοὺς μὲν καλεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἀπείργει· οὐ τῇ χεὶρὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῇ γλώττῃ τῆς χειρὸς τρανώτερον· ἡ γὰρ φωνὴ ἐκείνῃ τὴν ἀκοὴν ὑμπίπτουσα τὴν ἡμετέραν, καθάπερ χεῖρ, τοὺς μὲν ὠθεῖ καὶ ἐκβάλλει, τοὺς δὲ εἰσάγει καὶ παρίστησιν· ἐπὶ δὲ μοι, παρακαλῶ, ἐν τοῖς Ὀλυμπικοῖς ἀγῶσιν οὐχ ἔσταις ὁ κήρυξ βοῶν μίγα καὶ ὑψηλὸν λίγυ, Εἴ τις τούτου κατηγορεῖ, μὴ δούλος ἴσθι, μὴ κλίκτης, μὴ τρέπων πονηρῶν; καὶ τοι τὰ ἀγωνίσματα ἱκίῃνα οὐ ψυχῆς ἴσθιν, οὐδὲ τρέπου, ἀλλὰ βώμης καὶ σώματος· εἰ τοίνυν ἔνθα σώματος ἴσθιν ἄσκησις, πολλὴ προαίρεσις ἐξίτασις γίνεται, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐνταῦθα, ἔνθα τὸ πᾶν ψυχῇ ἀθλοῖ; ἔσταις τοίνυν ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν κήρυξ, οὗ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἵκαστον κατήχων καὶ παραγῶν, ἀλλὰ πνεύματος ἰμοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς Ἰνδοῦ κατήχων· οὐκ ἰφίστησιν ἄλλους, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς κατηγόρους ἑαυτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ λίγυ, Μὴ τις τούτου κατηγορεῖ; ἀλλὰ τί; εἴ τις ἑαυτοῦ; ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃ, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, τοῦτο λίγυ, Εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος, μὴ προσέτω· οὐχ ἀπλῶς, φησιν, ἁμαρτημάτων καθαροὺς, ἀλλὰ ἁγίους, κ. τ. λ.

¹ Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Coloss. p. 1337, (p. 176, edit. Francof.) Τούτους πρῶτους κατήγαγεν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τότε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀνήγαγε πρὸς αὐτούς· οὐρανὸς ἡ γῆ γίγνοντο, ἰαυδὴ τὰ τῆς γῆς ἔμειλλεν οὐρανὸς δίχισθαι· διὰ τοῦτο εὐχαριστοῦντες λίγομεν, Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἐιρήνῃ, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίᾳ.

made a heaven, because heaven was about to receive the things of the earth. Therefore, *εὐχαριστοῦντες λέγομεν*, ‘when we give thanks,’ or ‘celebrate the eucharist,’ we say, ‘Glory be to God on high, in earth peace, good-will towards men.’” And that by the ‘thanksgiving’ he here means the eucharist, is evident from another place, where he more precisely specifies the time of using it in the communion-service: *ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοί*, &c.^k “They who are communicants know what hymn is sung by the spirits above; what the cherubims say above; what the angels said, ‘Glory be to God on high:’ therefore our hymns come after our psalmody, as something more perfect.” Meaning that psalms were sung in the service of the catechumens; but these hymns, the cherubical hymn and the angelical hymn, more peculiarly in the communion-service.

SECT. XXXIII. — *Of the Psalm inviting to the Communion.*

St. Cyril adds,^l that after the hymn ‘One Holy,’ a psalm was sung, inviting them to participate of the holy mysteries, which was the thirty-first Psalm; and particularly those words, “Taste and see that the Lord is gracious.” “Which,” he tells them, “was not to be estimated or discerned by their corporeal taste, but by the certainty of faith. For they were not bid to taste bread and wine, but the antitype, or sign, of the body and blood of Christ.” This was a distinct psalm from those which were used to be sung afterward, whilst the people were communicating: for this was an invitatory to communicate, but the other were for meditation and devotion whilst they were actually partaking: of which there will be occasion to say something further in the next chapter.

^k Chrysostom. Hom. ix. in Coloss. p. 1380, (p. 228, edit. Francof.) *Τίς ὁ ὕμνος τῶν ἄνω, ἴσασιν οἱ πιστοί· τί λίγαι τὰ χειρουβὶμ ἄνω, τί ἔλεγον οἱ ἄγγελοι; Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ διὰ τοῦτο μετὰ τὰς ψαλμῳδίας ὕμνοι, ἅτις τελειότερόν τι πρᾶγμα.*

^l Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. sect. xviii. *Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀκούει τοῦ ψάλλοντος μετὰ μίλους Θεοῦ, προτρεπόμενου ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων, καὶ λίγοντος, Γινώσασθε καὶ ἴδτε, ὅτι χρηστός ὁ Κύριος· μὴ τῇ λάβρῳ τῷ σωματικῷ ἱπστρίσῃσι τὸ κριτικόν· οὐχί, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνινδοιάσῃ πίστις γινόμενοι γὰρ οὐκ ἄρετο καὶ οἶνον κελιεύονται γινώσασθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀντιτύπου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

SECT. XXXIV. — *The Consecration always performed with an audible Voice.*

Here we must note two things more which concern the consecration in general, in opposition to the corruptions of later ages. First, that as all Divine service was in a known tongue, so particularly the consecration of the eucharist was ordered to be pronounced both intelligibly and audibly, that the people might hear it, and answer "Amen." The contrary practice now prevails in the Roman Church: but both Habertus^m and Bonaⁿ own it to be innovation, of which there is no footstep till the tenth age, when first the ancient custom was superseded. It would be impertinent to produce authorities for a thing that is so plainly confessed and beyond dispute. And, therefore, I shall only note one thing upon this point, that when some little grumbling of this disease began to appear in the time of Justinian, he checked it in its first symptoms by a severe law,^o "Commanding all bishops and presbyters to make the Divine oblation, and the prayers used in baptism, not in secret, or with a low and muttering voice, but so as all the faithful people might hear them, to the greater devotion of their souls, and the greater praise and glory of God. For so the holy apostle teaches, saying, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, 'If thou shalt bless with the Spirit only, how shall he that occupieth the room

^m Habert. Archierat. part. viii. observat. ix. p. 145. Primus ritus est *ἱερῶν*, alta voce edita pronuntiatio; in Liturgiis S. Blasii et S. Chrysostomi *ἱερῶν λέγων*, ita ut non solum qui stant in sacrario sacerdotes, sed etiam populus universus audiat verba illa potentissima et augustissima, quibus corpus Christi conficitur. A quo sane ritu Romana nunc ecclesia dissidet, cujus ita Rubricæ habent; 'Secreto profert verba consecrationis super hostiam.' . . . Sane verba consecrationis alta voce ab initio pronuntiata teneant, necesse est, qui de eucharistia intelligendum volunt locum B. Pauli ex prima ad Corinthios epistolâ, xiv. 16. *Ἐὰν ὑλογίζηται*, &c.

ⁿ Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xiii. sect. i. p. 349. Græci et alii Orientales verba consecrationis elata voce pronuntiant, et populus respondet 'Amen.' . . . Eundem morem servabat olim ecclesia Occidentalis, omnes enim audiebant sanctissima et efficacissima verba, quibus Christi corpus conficitur. . . . Postea statutum est, ut canon submissa voce recitaretur, et sic desiit ea consuetudo sæculo decimo, ut conjicio, quia post Florum, qui nono labente vixit, ejus mentionem non reperi apud ævi posterioris scriptores.

^o See Bingham, vol. iv. pp. 159, 160.

of the unlearned, say ‘Amen,’ at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.’ Therefore, if any bishop or presbyter contemn this rule, they must give an account hereof in the dreadful judgment of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ: and we, when they come to our knowledge, will not suffer them to remain quiet and unpunished.” It is well for the Roman Church that the canon law is superior to the civil: else such a horrible abuse of all righteous, both Divine and human laws, would not go without its just revenges. This is one of those many good laws for which the Church is beholden to that learned emperor; whom yet Baronius,^p for the sake of these very laws does bespatter and rally, as an ignorant *analphabeticus*, an impious heretic, an invader of Divine rights, a man sick of the common distemper of kings, and whatever a partial historian could think of, that was indecent to be said, who was himself indeed sick with prejudice in favour of the common abuses and corruptions of his own Church, among which this is one of the most flaming and intolerable,—to pray every day in an unheard and unknown tongue,—so contrary to the authority of the apostle, and the rules of the Primitive Church, and the edification of Christian people, and the common sense and reason of mankind.^q

SECT. XXXV.—*And with Breaking of Bread, to represent our Saviour’s Passion.*

The other ceremony to be noted in the practice of the ancients is, that, in consecrating the eucharist, they always brake the bread, in conformity to our Saviour’s example, to represent his Passion and Crucifixion. Clemens Alexandrinus speaks of this as a general custom, when the eucharist was

^p Baron. an. 528, tom. vii. p. 144, (pp. 148, 149, edit. Antwerp. 1658.)

^q Chamier. de Eucharistia, lib. vi. c. ix. sect. xxix. Ad hanc legem (Justiniani) varix sunt exceptiones, prima de auctore, post de re. Bellarminus negat, ad imperatorem pertinere, de ritu sacrificandi leges ferre: proinde non multum referre, quid ille sanxerit, &c. — See Jewel against Harding, upon this subject.

^r Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. p. 318, 32. ἡ καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τινὲς διανίμναι, ὡς ἴδες, αὐτὸν δὲ ἱεραστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτερίπουσιν.

divided, or broken, to let every one of the people take his part. And St. Austin^s says the whole Church observed it, in blessing the bread, to break it for distribution. The reader that pleases may find other testimonies collected by Hospinian,^t out of Irenæus,^u Dionysius the Areopagite,^x Theophilus of Alexandria,^y and Cyril of Alexandria,^z and St. Chrysostom.^a Neither does Bona^b himself deny this, but proves it further from Gregory Nazianzen^c and Cæsarius Arelatensis, and all the

^s Aug. Epist. lix. ad Paulin. Quum benedicitur, et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminuitur, &c.

^t Hospin. Hist. Sacram. p. 30, (p. 26, edit. Genev. 1681.)

^u Iren. lib. v. c. ii. Quando mixtus calix et 'fractus' (Not. Alii secundum Græcum *γινώσκω*, legunt rectius 'factus') panis percipit verbum Dei, sit eucharistia sanguinis ac corporis Christi.

^x Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. sect. xii. p. 299. Τὸν ἱερῶς καλυμμένον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον ἄρτον ἀνακαλύψας, καὶ εἰς πολλὰ διελών, καὶ τὸ ἱναῖον τοῦ ποτηρίου πᾶσι καταμερίσας, συμβολικῶς τὴν ἰνότητα πληθύνει καὶ διανέμει, παναγιστάτην ἰν τοῦτοις ἱεροῦργίαν τιλῶν.

^y Theoph. Epist. Paschal. i. (Biblioth. Patr. Max. tom. v. p. 846, e.) Non recogitat . . . panem Dominicum, qua Salvatoris corpus ostenditur, et quem frangimus in sanctificationem nostri . . . per invocationem et adventum Sancti Spiritus sanctificari.

^z Cyril. in Joan. lib. xiv. (Ita adlegat Binghamus, Hospinianus habet, lib. iv. c. xiv. utraque adlegatio falsa.—Grischov.)

^a Chrysostom. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. 533, (p. 256, edit. Francof. b.) Διὰ τί δὲ προσέθηκαν, ὃν κλῶμιν; τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπὶ μὴν εὐχαριστίας ἵστιν ἰδίῳ γινόμενον. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ σταυροῦ οὐκ ἔστι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸναντίον τούτῳ. ὁστοῦν γὰρ αὐτοῦ, φησιν, οὐ συντριβήσεται; ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἔκαθεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ, τοῦτο πάσχι ἐπὶ τῆς προσφορᾶς διὰ σὲ, καὶ ἀνίχεται διακλώμενος, ἵνα πάντας ἱμπλήσῃ.

^b Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xv. sect. iii. (356.) Hujus fractionis tamquam in ecclesia semper et ubique a temporibus apostolorum usitatæ mentionem faciunt sancti patres, et alii ecclesiastici scriptores.—Clemens Alexandrinus, (lib. i. Strom.) Quum eucharistiam, ut mos est, dividerint permittunt, unicuique ex populo ejus partem sumere.—Dionys. (c. iii. Eccles. Hierarch. sect. xiii.), Pontifex, &c. (Vid. sub litt. anteced. *).—Gregorius Nazianzenus (Epist. ccxl. ad Amphilochoium), O Dei cultor sanctissime, &c. (Vid. sub litt. seq. c.). . . Omitto alios innumeros, præsertim recentiores. Liturgiæ quæcumque exstant, hanc fractionem præscribunt, ejusque mysteria edisserunt sacrorum rituum expositores, Amalarius (lib. iii. c. xxxi.), Walfridus (c. xxii.), Micrologus (cc. xviii. et xxiii.); Ivo Carnotensis (Tract. de Convenientia Vet. et Novi Sacrificii prope finem); Hugo a S. Victore (lib. ii. de Eccles. Offic. c. xxxix.); Honorius (in Gemma, lib. i. c. lxiii.); Germanus (in Expositione Liturgiæ); quibus addi possunt S. Thomas (part. iii. quæst. lxxxiii. art. v.); Ermlufus Roffensis episcopus (ep. ii. tom. ii. Spicilegii, quæst. ii.), et alii passim. Latini dividunt in tres partes, Græci et reliqui Orientales in quatuor, Mozarabes in novem.

^c Nazianz. Epist. ccxl. ad Amphilocho. in append. ad tom. i. Ὁ θιερῶς ἵσταται,

older ritualists and liturgies, of which he says there is not any that does not prescribe this breaking of bread; the Greeks, into four parts; the Latins, into three; and the Mozarabic Liturgy, into nine parts. Which is also noted by Mabillon, who adds,^d “That these nine parts in that liturgy are characterized by so many several names, viz. Incarnation, Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany or Manifestation, Passion, Death, Resurrection, Glory, and Kingdom.” Which is a little deviation from the simplicity of the ancient Church, yet not so culpable as the practice of the present Roman Church; where, instead of breaking bread for the communicants to partake of it, they only break a single wafer into three parts (of which no one partakes) only to retain a shadow of the ancient custom. Bona indeed calls this, breaking of bread according to Christ’s institution, or rather breaking of Christ’s body under the species of bread, when yet, according to their doctrine, Christ’s body is not broken; neither is it bread, but the species of bread, nor common bread, but a wafer, whereof the species is only broken, not the substance; and that not for communicating, but a show, to make men believe they are retainers of an ancient custom. The first disputers against the Reformation are more ingenuous. They freely own that the Roman Church has made an alteration: only they say she had good reasons for it, lest in breaking the bread some danger might happen, and some crumbs or particles of it perish; and then again, because the pope has power to alter any thing relating to the sacrament, according to the exigency of time and place, if it only concerns the ornament or accidentals of it. As if Christ himself could not have foreseen any dangers that might happen, or given

μη κατόκνει και προσεύχεται και περισβύειν υπε ημων, όταν λογη καθίληκε τὸν λόγον· όταν ἀναιμάκτῃ τομῇ σῶμα τέμνης δισπασικόν, φανὴν ἔχων τὸ ξίφος.

^d Mabillon. de Liturg. Gallican. lib. i. c. ii. p. 13. Sub hæc frangit hostiam in novem particulas, quæ his nominibus designantur, Corporatio, Nativitas, Circumcisio, Apparitio, Passio, Mors, Resurrectio, Gloria, Regnum.

^e Salmero, Tract. xxx. in Act. ap. Chamier. de Eucharist. lib. vii. c. xi. n. xxvi. p. 384, (p. 185, edit. 1627.) Quemadmodum Christus unum calicem communem omnibus tradidit ad bibendum, ita in una patina panem in duodecim bucellas fractum manibus suis dispensavit. Nos vero corpus Christi de custodia profundiori porrigimus, ne per suspiria, aut auram, aut alia impedimenta communicantium, contingat de patina excidere.

as prudent orders as the pope concerning his own institution! But it is sufficient to have observed this variation of the Church of Rome, though in a smaller matter, from the primitive practice, together with their reasons for such a change: of which the reader may see more in Chamier or Bishop Jewel, who have more particularly canvassed and examined all the pleas that are offered on the other side by the advocates of that Church for this and many other alterations.^f I now go on with the primitive account, which leads us next to consider the communicants themselves, who were allowed to receive this sacrament; and the manner of communicating and receiving it.

CHAPTER IV.

OF COMMUNICANTS, OR PERSONS, WHO WERE ALLOWED TO
RECEIVE THIS SACRAMENT, AND THE MANNER OF RE-
CEIVING IT.

SECT. I.—*All Persons, except Catechumens and Penitents,
obliged to receive the Eucharist.*

Now that we are come to the act of communicating, we must first consider what persons were allowed, or rather obliged, to receive this holy sacrament; and, then, after what manner, they received it. For the first, we are to remember, what has been often observed before, that, as soon as the service of the catechumens was ended, a deacon was used to call upon all catechumens, and those that were under penance, to withdraw; and admonish all others to stay at the prayers of the faithful, and make their oblation, and receive the communion. Whence it is evident, that the most ancient and primitive custom was, for all that were allowed to stay and communicate in prayers, to communicate in the participation of the eucharist also, except only the last class of penitents, who were admitted to hear the prayers, but not to make their oblation, nor receive the

^f Vid. Chamier, ubi supra, and Jewel's Reply to Harding, art. ii. p. 327.

communion; whence they had the name of *consistentes*, 'co-standers,' because they might stay to communicate in the prayers, but still *δίχα προσφορᾶς*, 'without the oblation,' as the ancient canons word it. These only excepted, all other baptized persons were not only permitted, but, by the rules of the Church, obliged, to communicate in the eucharist, under pain of ecclesiastical censure. The most ancient canons are very express to this purpose. Among those called the Apostolical Canons,^a there is one runs in these words: "All such of the faithful as come to church, and hear the Scriptures read, but stay not the prayers, and to partake of the holy communion, ought to be suspended, as authors of disorder in the church." Which the Council of Antioch repeats with a little enlargement:^b "All such as come into the church of God, and hear the Holy Scriptures read, but do not communicate with the people in prayer, and refuse to partake of the eucharist, — which is a disorderly practice, — ought to be cast out of the church, till they confess their fault, and bring forth fruits of repentance; when, if they ask pardon, they may obtain it." Martin Bracarenensis^c puts this canon into his Collection, for the use of the Spanish Church; and Gratian^d alleges a decree of Pope Anacletus, which orders all to communicate when the consecration was ended, if they would not be cast out of the

^a Can. Apostol. x. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας πιστοὺς εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ παραμένοντας διὰ τῆ προσευχῆ καὶ τῇ ἀγίᾳ μεταλήψει, ὡς ἂν ἀταξίαν ἐμποιούντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρή. — See also Can. viii. for the clergy.

^b Conc. Antioch. c. ii. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωούντας διὰ εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφόμενους τὴν μετάληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατὰ τινὰ ἀταξίαν τούτους ἀποσπλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὥς ἂν ἐξομολογησάμενοι καὶ δείξαντες καρπὸς μετανοίας, καὶ παρακαλίσαντες τυχὸν δυνηθῶσι συγγνώμης.

^c Martin. Bracar. Collect. Can. c. lxxxiii. ap. Justell. append. tom. i. fol. xxxii. Si quis intrat ecclesiam Dei et Sacras Scripturas audit, et pro luxuria sua avertat se a communione sacramenti et in observandis mysteriis declinat constitutam regulam disciplinæ: illum talem projiciendum de ecclesia catholica esse decernimus; donec pœnitentiam agat, et ostendat fructum pœnitentiæ suæ, ut possit communionem, percepta indulgentia, promereri.

^d Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. ii. c. x. Peracta consecratione omnes, communcent, qui noluerint ecclesiasticis carere liminibus. Sic enim et apostoli statuerunt, et sancta Romana tenet ecclesia.

church : for so the apostles appointed, and the holy Roman Church observed that order. Which, though it be a supposititious decree, yet it is made in conformity to the ancient discipline, and shews the practice that was then prevailing, even in the Roman Church.

SECT. II.—*When and how this Discipline began first to relax.*

In St. Chrysostom's time, some began to desire they might have liberty to stay during the performance of the whole office, and yet not be obliged to communicate. They were not willing to be accounted penitents, and be driven out with them; and yet they would not be communicants, and orderly partake with the Church. Against these St. Chrysostom inveighs, after his usual manner, with a great deal of eloquence, and becoming sharpness.* “Are you unworthy of the sacrifice, and unfit to partake of it [for that was their plea]? neither then are you worthy of the prayers. Do you not hear the Church's herald standing, and proclaiming, ‘All ye that are penitents withdraw?’ All they that do not communicate, are penitents. If thou art of the number of penitents, thou mayest not partake; for he that is not a partaker, is a penitent. Why does he say, ‘All ye that cannot pray, be gone?’ And why do you impudently stay?—You are not one of those, you will say, but of those that may partake. Consider, I pray, and seriously weigh the matter. The royal table is prepared, the angels stand ministering by, the Lord himself is present: and do you stand yawning as an idle spectator only? Your garments are defiled, and are you under no concern? Yea, but, say you, they are clean; then sit down, and partake. The King comes daily to see the guests, and discourses with

* Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051, (p. 888, edit. Francof.) Οὐκ εἰ τῆς θυσίας ἄξιος, οὐδὲ τῆς μεταλήψεως; οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ τῆς εὐχῆς. ἀκούεις ἱστωτὸς τοῦ κήρυκος, καὶ λίγοντος, “Οσοὶ ἐν μετανοίᾳ, ἀπίλθισι. πάντες, ὅσοι μὴ μετήχουσιν, ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰσὶν” εἰ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἶ, μετασχίῃν οὐκ ὀφείλεις· ὁ γὰρ μὴ μετήχων, ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἵστί. τίνας οὖν ἔνικεν λίγει, Ἀπίλθιστε οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι διεθῆναι; εὐ δὲ ἴστηκας ἱταμῶς; ἀλλ’ οὐκ εἰ τούτων, ἀλλὰ τῶν δυνάμενων μετήχουσιν, καὶ οὐδὲν φροντίζεις, οὐδὲν ἡγῇ τὸ πρῶγμα; σκόπει, παρακαλῶ· τρέπεται πάριστοι βασιλικῇ, ἄγγιλοι διακονοῦμενοι τῇ τραπέζῃ, αὐτὸς πάριστιν ὁ Βασιλεὺς,

them all; and now he says, 'In your consciences, friends, how came you to stand here, not having on a wedding-garment? He said not, 'Why art thou set down?' But, before he was set down, before he was entered, he pronounced him unworthy; for, he said not, 'Why art thou set down?' but, 'Why camest thou in hither?' The same now he says to every one of us, that stand here with an impudent boldness; for every one that does not partake, is shameless and impudent. They that are in sin are, for this reason, first cast out. As, therefore, none of those, who are not initiated, ought to be present; so neither any of those who are initiated, if they be defiled. Tell me, if any one that is invited to a feast washes his hands, and sits down, and is ready for the table, and yet, after all, eats not, does he not affront him that invited him? Were it not better that such a man should not be present? Likewise thou also art present: thou hast sung the hymn, and made profession with the rest, that thou art one of those that art worthy, in that thou didst not depart with the unworthy. How is it that thou remainest, and yet dost not partake at the table? Thou sayest, 'I am unworthy.' Thou art, then, unworthy also of the communion of prayers." I have transcribed this long but elegant passage of Chrysostom to shew, that in his time, by the rules of the Church, none were allowed to

καὶ οὐ ἴσθηκας χασμῶμενος; ῥυπαρά σοι τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ οὐδὲς σοι λόγος; ἀλλὰ καθαρά ἐστιν. οὐκοῦν ἀνάπισσον καὶ μίτιχι' ἔρχεται καθ' ἑκάστην ἰδίῃ τοὺς ἀνακτιμένους, πᾶσι διαλίγεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ συνιδότι ἱερῇ, 'Εταῖροι, πῶς ἰσθήκατε ὦδε, μὴ ἔχοντες ἵνδυμα γάμου; οὐκ εἶπεν, Διὰ τί ἀνέπισαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῆς κατακλίσεως καὶ τῆς ἐσόδου ἀνάξιον αὐτὸν εἶναι φησὶν' οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, Διὰ τί κατακλίθης; ἀλλὰ, Τί ἐσθήθης; ταῦτα καὶ νῦν πρὸς ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς διαλίγεται, τοὺς ἀναίσχυντους καὶ ἱταμῶς ἰσθῶτας' πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μὴ μετίχων τῶν μυστηρίων, ἀναίσχυντος καὶ ἱταμῶς ἰσθηκῶς. οἱ ἐν ἀμαρτήμασι' ἐπὶ τοῦτο πρότερον ἐκβάλλονται καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τραπίζης, παραγινόμενον τοῦ δισπότου, οὐ διὰ τοὺς προσκυκερυκώτας τῶν οἰκιστῶν παρῆναι, ἀλλ' ἐκποδὼν γίνονται' οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῦθα, ἐκφιομένης τῆς θυσίας, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τιθυμένου, καὶ τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ δισποτικοῦ, ὅταν ἀκούσης, δηλώμεν πάντας κοινῇ, ὅταν ἴδῃς ἀνιλέμενα τὰ ἀμφίβυρα, τότε νόμιμον διαστίλλεσθαι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔνθεν, καὶ πατεῖναι τοὺς ἀγγέλους. ὥσπερ τοῖνυν τῶν ἀμύητων οὐδὲνα χερὶ παρῆναι, οὕτως οὐδὲ τῶν μεμνημένων καὶ ῥυπαρῶν. εἰπέ μοι, εἴ τις εἰς ἰστίαν κληθεῖς, τὰς χεῖρας νίψαιτο, καὶ κατακλιθῇ, καὶ ἵτοιμος γένοιτο πρὸς τὴν τραπίζαν, ἵνα μὴ μετίχῃ, οὐχ ὑβρίζῃ τὸν καλίσαντα; οὐ βέλτιον τὸν τοιοῦτον μὴδὲ παραγινέσθαι; οὕτω δὲ καὶ σὺ παραγίνοντας' τὸν ὕμνον' ἦσας μετὰ πάντων ἀμολόγησας εἶναι τῶν ἀξίων τῇ μὴ μετὰ τῶν ἀνάξιον ἀνακχωρηθῆναι' πῶς ἔμινας, καὶ οὐ μετίχεις τῆς τραπίζης; 'Ανάξιός εἰμι, φησὶν' οὐκοῦν καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας ἐκίνης τῆς ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς.

refrain from partaking of the eucharist upon the pretence of unworthiness, who were not deemed unworthy to be present at the prayers also.

But, in the very next age, this discipline was a little relaxed, and men who would not communicate, were not only permitted, but enjoined, to stay during the whole service, till after the Lord's Prayer and the bishop's benediction; which, as has been shewed in the last chapter (sect. xxx.), was not till the whole consecration was ended, immediately before the act of partaking: at which time this sort of non-communicants were dismissed with a solemn prayer, called the 'benediction,' as appears from the Councils of Orleans and Agde, before referred to. For the Council of Agde gives special order,^f "That all secular men, on the Lord's day, should stay to hear mass, and not depart before the bishop's benediction." And the Council of Orleans says the same,^g "That the people should not depart before the solemnity of the mass was ended; that is, till the consecration-prayers were completed: and then, if the bishop were not present, they should receive the benediction of the priest." So that what, in Chrysostom's time, was reckoned a crime, was presently after accounted a piece of devotion, for the people to stay and hear the whole solemnity of the service to the time of communicating, and then they might depart without partaking of the communion; which was plainly a relaxation of the ancient discipline, and a deviation from the primitive practice.

SECT. III.—*When first the Use of Eulogiæ came in, instead of the 'Eucharist,' for such as would not communicate.*

And this brought in another innovation along with it, that such as would not communicate, might yet partake of the *eulogiæ*, or a sort of 'consecrated bread,' distinct from the eucharist. The *eulogiæ*, in the more ancient writers, is

^f Conc. Agath. c. xlvii. vol. iv. p. 1391. Missas die Dominico sæcularibus audire speciali ordine præcipimus, ita ut ante benedictionem sacerdotis egredi populus non præsumat, &c.

^g Conc. Aurel. I. c. xxviii. Quum ad celebrandas missas in Dei nomine convenitur, populus non ante discedat, quam missæ solemnitas compleatur: et ubi episcopus non fuerit, benedictionem accipiat sacerdotis.

the very same with the 'eucharist,' and used by them to signify the same thing as St. Paul means, when he says, "The cup of blessing,' ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) And so it is always used by Cyril of Alexandria and Chrysostom, as learned men^b have observed out of many places of their writings; but, in after ages, it was distinguished from the eucharist, as something that, after a sort, supplied the room of it. The Council of Nantes,ⁱ about the year 890, ordered the presbyters to keep some part of the people's oblations till after the service, that such as were not prepared to communicate, might, on every festival and Lord's day, receive some of this *eulogia*, when blessed with a proper benediction. Some collectors of the canons^k ascribe this decree to Pope Pius the martyr, who lived in the second century; but Bona ingenuously owns that to be a forgery;^l and says further, that the men who father this decree upon him, considered not that in his time there was no such thing as this kind of *eulogia* in the Church; about which Tertulian, Cyprian, and all their contemporaries, are altogether silent; because in those days all that were present at the sacrifice, were wont to communicate; but these *eulogiæ* were invented in after ages for those who could not, or would not, be partakers of the holy mysteries. This is an ingenuous confession of that learned writer, who, where the cause of his Church is not deeply concerned, commonly speaks his mind with a great deal of freedom, and uses a just liberty in taxing the innovations of the monks and schoolmen.

^b Vid. Casaubon. Exercit. xvi. in Baron. n. xxxiii. pp. 517, 518, edit. Lond. 1614. — Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. ii. c. ii. p. 749, a. sect. 'Sexto,' &c. — Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. voce εὐλογία, tom. i. pp. 1249–1251. — And Bona himself owns it.

ⁱ Conc. Nannetens. c. ix. Partes incisae habeat in vase nitido et convenienti, ut post missarum solemnias, qui communicare non fuerint parati, eulogias omni die Dominico et in diebus festis exinde accipiant, quas cum benedictione prius faciat.

^k Crab. Conc. tom. i. p. 87.

^l Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. xxiii. n. xii.

SECT. IV.—*The Corruption of Private and Solitary Mass unknown to former Ages.*

But in the business of private or solitary mass, where the credit and interest of the Roman Church is more immediately concerned, he acts a little more like an artist, and labours to palliate what he cannot either heartily or solidly defend. That we call ‘solitary mass,’ where the priest receives alone, without any other communicants, and sometimes says the office alone, without any assistants: such are all those private and solitary masses in the Roman Church, which are said at their private altars in the corners of their churches, without the presence of any but the priest alone, and all those public masses, where none but the priest receives, though there be many spectators of the action. As there is no agreement of either of these with the institution of Christ, but a direct opposition to it (for that was designed to be a communion among many: “We, being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread,” which is impossible where there are no communicants): so there is not the least footstep of any such practice in the Primitive Church. Bellarmin offers faintly some poor conjectures about it, whilst he fairly owns,^m that there is no express testimony to be found among the ancients, that they ever offered the sacrifice without the communion of one or more persons beside the priest. All his conjectures are mere trifles, and the first of them directly against himself; for he would have his reader conjecture from the Council of Nante, cited by Ivo,ⁿ that the ancients

^m Bellarmin. de Missa, lib. ii. c. ix. p. 821, (p. 353, d. edit. Colon. 1615.) Etiam si nusquam expresse legamus, a veteribus oblatum sacrificium sine communione alicujus, vel aliquorum, præter ipsum sacerdotem; tamen id possumus ex conjecturis facile colligere. Prima conjectura ex Concilio Nannetensi, c. xxx. quod citatur ab Ivone in Decret. part. iii. c. lxx. ubi jubentur presbyteri non celebrare soli missam, nisi habeant saltem unum secum, qui respondeat. Ex quo intelligimus, quosdam plane solos celebrare solitos missæ sacrificium: et proinde sine communicantibus.

ⁿ Conc. Nannetens. ap. Ivonem, part. iii. c. lxx. Definivit sanctum concilium, ut nullus presbyter solus præsumat missam celebrare. Cui etenim dicit, ‘Dominus vobiscum,’ ‘Sursum corda,’ aut, ‘Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro,’ quum nullus sit, qui respondeat? aut in canone, ‘Et omnium circumstantium;’

allowed of solitary mass by the priest alone, because that Council takes occasion to mention the practice, only to forbid and censure it, which it does in very severe terms; which it will not be amiss here to transcribe, to shew what opposition the corruption met with, as soon as it began to appear among the monks, who were the first inventors of it. "The holy Council," say they, "gives strict order, that no presbyter shall presume to celebrate mass by himself alone; for to whom shall he say, 'The Lord be with you;' or, 'Lift up your hearts;' or, 'Let us give thanks to our Lord God,' when there is none to answer him? Or, how shall he say those words in the canon itself, 'All that are here present,' when there is no one present with him? Or whom does he invite to pray, when he says, 'Let us pray,' when there is no one to pray with him? Therefore he must either pass over these things in silence, and so not only make the sacrifice imperfect, and incur that terrible sentence, which says, 'If any one shall take away from this, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life;' or else, if he mutters these things to the bare stones and walls, it will be ridiculous: therefore this dangerous superstition is by all means to be exterminated, especially out of the monasteries of the monks. And let all prelates take care, that the presbyters in convents, and other churches, have always some fellow-workers, or attendants, in the celebration of mass." One must needs conclude, that Bellarmin was driven to very hard shifts, in defence of a desperate cause, when he was forced to allege this canon as a proof of the practice of solitary mass among the ancients, which does not so much as prove it to be a lawful practice among the moderns, but is such a flaming evidence against it, as a novelty, that makes

quum nemo adsit? aut quem invitat ad orationem, quum dicit, 'Oremus;' quum nullus sit, qui secum oret? Aut ergo ista penitus reticenda sunt, et non solum non erit perfectum sacrificium, verum etiam incurret, quisquis est ille, illam terribilem sententiam: 'Si quis tulerit de hoc, tollat Deus partem ejus de Libro Vitæ:' aut si hæc muris et parietibus insurraverit, ridiculosum erit. Quapropter illa periculosa superstitio, maxime a monasteriis monachorum, exterminanda est. Prævideant autem prælati, ut presbyter in cœnobiis et in aliis ecclesiis cooperatores habeat in celebratione missarum. Si quis hæc transgressus fuerit, ab officio suspendatur.—Vid. Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xiii. n. v.

nonsense of all their service, and makes them speak to the walls, and is by all means to be exterminated out of the monasteries; where it first began, as a dangerous and ridiculous superstition. Cardinal Bona is not much happier than Bellarmin in his management of this point; for in one chapter he undertakes^o to prove solitary mass a novelty, unknown to the ancient Church, and against the very tenour of the present Roman canon; and in the next chapter he pretends to prove, that private mass, without communicants or assistants, is a very ancient and laudable practice. First he tells us, "That the very tenour of the mass, and the practice of the ancient Church, evince, that the sacrifice was originally instituted, principally, to be publicly and solemnly performed by the clergy and people standing, offering and communicating together: for all the prayers, and the very words of the canon, are spoken in the plural number, as in the name of many. Hence it is, that the priest, inviting the people to pray, says, 'Let us pray;' and when he salutes them, he says, 'The Lord be with you.' And then the people being admonished to lift up their hearts unto God, answer, 'We lift them up unto the Lord.'" Hence it is, that in the very canon he always prays in the name of the people

^o Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xiii. n. ii. Ab initio sic sacrificium principaliter institutum fuisse, ut publice ac solemniter fieret, clero et populo adstante, offerente ac communicante, ipse tenor missæ et veteris ecclesiæ praxis evincunt. Omnes enim orationes, atque ipsa canonis verba in plurali numero, tamquam plurium nomine proferuntur. Hinc sacerdos populum invitat ad orationem, dicens, 'Oremus:' et quum eundem salutatur, ait, 'Dominus vobiscum.' Tum moniti fideles, ut corda erigant ad Deum, respondent, 'Habemus ad Dominum.' Hinc etiam in canone collectæ plebis nomine semper oratur, ut quum dicit, 'Supplices rogamus et petimus: hanc oblationem cunctæ familiæ tuæ offerimus præclaræ majestati tuæ: ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumserimus: nobis quoque peccatoribus;' et alia hujusmodi multa. Ex quibus liquet, nihil aliud esse missam, quam sacerdotis et totius cætus actionem, cui plures circumstetisse indicant illa verba, 'Et omnium circumstantium, quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota devotio,' quæ alio detorqueri non possunt. Ad communionem vero adstantium ea spectant, quibus sacerdos Deum precatur, fieri corpus et sanguinem Domini omnibus sumentibus in vitam æternam. Et post communionem ait, 'Quod ore sumsimus, pura mente capiamus: satiasti familiam tuam muneribus sacris:' suntque fere omnes ejusdem tenoris orationes, quæ peracta communionem recitantur; quia nimirum illi duntaxat intererant missæ, qui possent offerre et de sacramento participare.

gathered together, of which, giving several instances, he infers, that from thence it is clear, that the mass is nothing else but the action of the priest and the whole congregation; which, he says, is proved further from those words of the prayer, *Omnium circumstantium*, &c. 'All that stand here, whose faith and devotion is known to thee,' which cannot be wrested to any other sense. And that all that were present did communicate, he says, appears from those words of the priest, when he prays, "That the body and blood of Christ may be to all that receive to eternal life." And after the communion, he says, "What we have received with our mouths, let us receive with a pure mind;" and, "Thou hast filled thy family with thy gifts;" and almost all the prayers, which are said after communicating, are of the same tenour, because no others could be present but such as could offer and partake of the sacrament; which he proves^p from

^p Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xiii. n. ii. Cyprianus (Serm. de Lapsis), et Leo Pupa (Serm. iv. de Quadrag.), populi communicantis mentionem faciunt: et c. x. Apost. ac II. Concilii Antiocheni sub Julio I. decernitur, ut omnes fideles, qui ad ecclesiam conveniunt, communicent; recusantes ab ecclesia rejiciantur et excommunicentur. — Sciendum est (inquit Micrologus, c. li.), quod soli communicantes divinis mysteriis interesse consueverunt, unde et ante oblationem juxta canones jubebantur exire catechumeni et pœnitentes, videlicet qui nondum se paraverant ad communicandum. Hoc quoque ipsa sacramentorum innuit confectio, in qua sacerdos non pro sola sua oblatione et communicatione, sed et aliorum, rogat, et maxime in oratione post communionem pro solis communicantibus orare videtur. Nec proprie communio dici potest, nisi plures de eodem sacrificio participent. — Ibid. sect. iv. Odo Cameracensis in expositione canonis ad illa verba, 'et omnium circumstantium,' 'Quum primitus,' inquit, 'missæ sine collecta non fierent, postea mos inolevit ecclesiæ solitarias, et maxime in cœnobiis, fieri missas. Et quum non habeant, quam pluraliter collectam saluent, nec plurales mutare possint salutationes, convertunt se ad ecclesiam dicentes, se ecclesiam in ecclesia salutare.' Et paucis interjectis, 'Secundum quem sensum in hoc loco circumstantes accipiuntur omnes ubique fideles, qui in unitate totius corporis et sibi adherent invicem et summo capiti.' — Consonat Stephanus Eduensis ita scribens, lib. de Sacram. altaris c. xlii.: Sciendum est, quod si unus tantum sit præsens, vel nulli sint præsentes, ut in missis solitariis: non ideo mutantur, quæ pluraliter solent fieri orationes. Primo enim missæ non solebant celebrari sine collecta fidelium multitudine. Postea mos inolevit, solitarios sicut monachos celebrare solitarias, quod eis concessum est ex indulgentia. Inde etiam sæculares consueverunt missas cantare privatas. Tunc fiunt salutationes ad omnes fideles, qui adsistunt quasi præsentes, fide et caritate sacramentis communicantes. — Id. sect. v. "Concilium Moguntinum sub Leone III. (c. xliii.) ait, 'Nullus presbyter, ut nobis videtur, solus missam cantare valet recte.' Quomodo enim dicet, 'Domi-

Cyprian and Pope Leo, and the Apostolical Canons, and the Council of Antioch. To these he adds the testimonies of Micrologus, and Odo Cameracensis, and Stephanus Eduensis, concerning the same practice of the Primitive Church, which they own was different from that of their own times, when solitary mass was brought in by the monks. Nay, he adds, that solitary mass was forbidden by several councils and canons expressly, when it began to appear. Among which he relates the fore-mentioned canon of the Council of Nantes, and the Council of Metz, under Leo. III. (can. xliii.); and the Capitular of the kings of France, collected by Benedictus Levita (lib. v. cap. xliii.); and the Capitular of Theodulphus Aurelianensis (cap. vii); and the Synodical Epistle of Ratherius Veronensis, published by Dacherius (Spicileg. tom. ii.); and the Synod of Paris, under Gregory IV. (an. 829); which is most remarkable, because it shews us both the original, and the grounds and motives that introduced this corruption. "A very culpable custom," say they,^q "is crept in, in many places, partly by negligence,

nus vobiscum,' vel, 'Sursum corda' admonebit habere, et alia multa his similia, quum alius nemo cum eo sit? Quæ verba transtulit in Capitulare Regum Franciæ Benedictus Levita (lib. v. c. xciii.), et Synodus Parisiensis sub Gregorio IV. (lib. i. c. xlviii.) Irrepsit, &c. Exstat et decretum Concilii Nannetensis idem vetans apud Ivonem, (p. iii. c. lxx.), 'Definit sanctum Concilium,' &c. Similiter Theodulfus Aurelianensis episcopus in suo Capitulari ad Clerum, c. vii. ait, 'Sacerdos missam solus nequaquam celebret. Esse enim debent, qui ei circumstant, quos iste salutet, a quibus ei respondeatur, et ad memoriam illi reducendum est illud Dominicum, Ubi cumque fuerint duo vel tres in nomine meo congregati, et ego sum in medio eorum.' Ratherius item Veronensis Episcopus editus a Luca Dacherio (tom. ii. Spicilegii), in epistola synodica ad presbyteros, 'Nullus solus missam cantet.'

^q Conc. Paris. lib. i. c. xlviii. Irrepsit, in plerisque locis, partim incuria, partim avaritia, reprehensibilis usus, et congrua emendatione dignus, eo quod nonnulli presbyterorum sine ministris missarum solemniam frequentent. Unde conveniendus, immo interrogandus nobis videtur hujusmodi corporis ac sanguinis Domini . . . solitarius consecrator, quibus dicit, 'Dominus vobiscum,' et a quo illi respondetur, 'Et cum spiritu tuo:' vel pro quibus supplicando Domino inter cetera, 'Memento, Domine, et Omnium circumstantium,' quum nullus circumstat, dicit. Quæ consuetudo quia apostolicæ et ecclesiasticæ auctoritati refragatur, et tanto mysterio quamdam dehonorationem irrogare videtur, omnibus nobis in commune visum est, ut deinceps hujuscemodi usus inhibeatur, provideatque unusquisque episcoporum, ne in sua parochia quisquam presbyterorum missam solus celebrare præsumat. (See Bona, Rer. Lit. i. xiii. n. v.)

and partly by covetousness, which ought by all means to be reformed, that some presbyters celebrate mass without any attendants. Whence it is proper to convene, and ask every such busy consecrator of the body and blood of the Lord, to whom he uses those words, 'The Lord be with you?' And who answers him, 'And with thy spirit?' Or for whom he supplicates the Lord when he says, among other things, 'Remember those that stand about me,' when there are none standing about him? Which custom, therefore, being contrary to apostolical and ecclesiastical authority, and bringing a reproach upon so great a mystery, it seems good to us all, in common, to inhibit it for the future; and that every bishop take care, that no presbyter within his diocess shall presume to celebrate mass by himself alone." Bona owns, that all these councils prohibited solitary mass upon this ground, that it made all such expressions as those, "The Lord be with you," and "Lift up your hearts," &c. to be nonsense, and absurd. And he adds some canons out of Gratian,^r under the name of Pope Soter and Anacletus, which ordain, "That no presbyter should presume to celebrate mass, except there be, at least, two present beside himself." Upon which he takes occasion to make this just reflection,^s "That these could not be the decrees of those ancient bishops, because solitary mass was a thing never heard of in their age; and he could not think they would make laws to take away an abuse, which crept not in till some ages after among the monks." Would it not now perfectly amaze a man, after all this, to hear the same author declare, in the very first words of his next chapter, "That the laudable custom of private mass, without any communicants, or the presence of any but one priest, was always the practice of the Church?

^r Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. i. c. lxi. (ap. Bon. l. c. sect. vi.) Hoc quoque statutum est, ut nullus presbyterorum, &c. Ab aliis tribuitur Anacleto, in cujus ep. i. leguntur hæc verba: 'Sacerdotes, quando Domino sacrificant, non soli hoc agere debent, sed testes secum adhibeant, ut Domino perfecto in sacratibus Deo sacrificare locis probentur.'

^s Bon. lib. i. c. xiii. n. vi. Neutri convenire certissimum est; nihil enim magis alienum a praxi et spiritu illius sæculi, quam solitariæ missæ celebratio, nec puto voluisse sanctos illos Pontifices edita lege abusum tollere, qui non nisi post aliquot sæcula inter monachos irrepsit.

And that the heretics who hate liturgy" (so he wrongfully^t slanders the Protestants), "could never demonstrate that it was prohibited," when he himself has so fully demonstrated it to their hands? But now he will undertake to demonstrate, on the contrary, "That private mass, in whatever sense we take it, was always lawful, and in use, from the most approved testimonies and examples of the primitive fathers. And yet, when he comes to the proof, he offers not so much as one instance of that sort of private mass, where the priest ministers alone, without the presence of the people, which is called solitary mass, though he approves of it; nor says he any thing material for that sort of private mass, where the priest partakes without any other communicants, though in the presence of all the people; but only urges a mistaken passage of Chrysostom (urged before by Bellarmin and Harding, and answered by Chamier), where he says," "In vain do we stand at the altar, in vain is the daily sacrifice offered: there is no one that communicates." As if Chrysostom had had neither presbyter, nor deacon, nor any of the people, to communicate with him above once a-year in the great churches of Antioch or Constantinople, because many were so negligent as not to communicate oftener; whom he justly reproves in a hyperbolical way of speaking, which does not mean that he communicated by himself alone, but that many were guilty of a gross neglect; whilst others, as Chrysostom himself says, were more assiduous and zealous. And yet this is one of the best proofs Bona can give, after all his boasts of demonstration; which shews, that he was as hard put to it to defend an indefensible cause, as Pope Innocent III. was, when, to answer the objection that is urged in this very argument, how the priest can say, *Orate pro me, fratres*, 'Pray for me, brethren,' seeing he is alone, without assistants,—he is forced to say,^x "That it is

^t Bon. lib. i. c. xiv. n. i. Semper viguit in ecclesia privata missæ, uno saltem præsentē et ministrante, laudabilis consuetudo, quam hæretici misoliturgi aliquando prohibitam fuisse numquam poterunt demonstrare.

^u Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. (p. 888, edit. Francof.) Εἰς τὴν θυσίαν καθήμενός, εἰς τὴν παρουσίαμιν τῇ θυσιαστικῇ, οὐδὲν ἰσχυρὸν.

^x Innocent. de Offic. Missæ, lib. ii. c. xxiv. ap. Juel, art. i. p. 51, (p. 27, edit. Lips. 1534.) Statutum est in sacris canonibus, ut nullus presbyterorum missarum

piously to be believed, that the angels of God are our associates in prayer." Which answer does not untie the knot:¹ for though they are present, they are not present as communicants, to eat and drink with us the body and blood of Christ. Neither can the priest be supposed to say to the angels, "Take, eat: this is my body," according to Christ's command. Evident, therefore, it is, beyond all contradiction, that, whether we consider the institution itself, or the practice of the apostles and the Primitive Church, or the tenour of all the ancient liturgies, which the reader may find collected in Chamier,² with the testimonies of the fathers upon the subject; or even the tenour of the Roman mass itself; or the opposition this corruption met with at its first appearance; the eucharist was not intended as a sacrifice to be offered by a single priest in a corner, without communicants or assistants, or for the intention, or at the cost of some particular person paying for it, but for a communion to the whole Church, as the Primitive Church always used it; and there is not an example to be found of the contrary practice.

SECT. V.—*Other Corruptions countenanced some time in the Roman Church, as the Missa Sicca and Nautica, and those called Bifaciata and Trifaciata.*

But this was not the only abuse which crept into the Church, in later ages, against the ancient way of celebrating the holy communion. For Bona^a himself takes notice of

solemnia celebrare præsumat, nisi duobus præsentibus, sibi que respondentibus, ipse tertius habeatur. Quia quum pluraliter ab eo dicitur, 'Dominus vobiscum;' et illud in secretis, 'Orate pro me,' apertissime convenit, ut illius salutationi respondeatur a pluribus. Verum aliud est necessitatis articulus, et aliud religionis contemptus. Pie quoque credendum est, et sacris auctoritatibus comprobatur, quod angeli Dei comites adsistant orantibus, juxta illud propheticum, 'In conspectu angelorum psallam tibi,' &c.

¹ Bona (lib. ii. c. v. sect. i. 512) says, 'This answer of the pope is piously meant, but not solid and true.' Hoc deinde antiquatum fuit, non quia celebranti adesse credantur angeli, ut pie scripsit Innocentius III. (lib. ii. de Myst. Missæ, c. xxv.) quasi ex hoc inferret, numquam celebranti deesse adstantes, &c.

² Chamier. de Eucharist. lib. vii. cc. xvii.—xix.

^a Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. xv. n. vi. Missa sicca ab indiscreta et privata quorundam devotione duxit originem, cui nimium indulgentes fuerunt sacerdotes.

two more, which he censures as heartily as one could wish, though they found great encouragement in their time. They are corruptions not commonly met with in other authors; and, therefore, I will give the reader an account of them from him. The one was called *missa sicca*, 'dry mass;' "Which," he says, "took its original from the indiscreet and private devotion of some, to which the priests were too indulgent. It is a mere mark and counterfeit of the true mass, properly dry and jejune, as wanting not only the consecration, but the participation of the body of Christ: like that supper of wood and stones, which Lampridius and other

Larva est et simulatio quædam veræ missæ, sicca procul dubio et jejuna, utpote carens non solum consecratione, sed etiam sumptione corporis Christi, similis cænæ lignæ et lapideæ, quam Lampridius et alii referunt sæpe convivis suis Helio-gubalium exhibuisse. Invaluit tamen adeo, ut aliquando viris sanctis et doctis non displicuerit. Gulielmus de Nangiaco monachus, in libro Gestorum S. Ludovici, narrat, religiosissimum regem, quum e transmarinis partibus rediret in Galliam, corpus Christi in navi decentissime collocari, atque ibi officia Divina et missam, excepto canone, quotidie celebrari fecisse. Eandem commendat Genebrardus (lib. de Liturgia Apostolica, c. xxx.) pro his, qui mane integræ missæ interesse non possunt, pro navigantibus, pro infirmis, et quando defuncti post meridiem sepeliendi sunt; pro qua re in usu fuisse suis temporibus testatur, seque Taurini, an. 1587, in exsequiis viri nobilis, qui vespere sepeliebatur, hujusmodi missæ cum diacono et subdiacono cantatæ interfuisse. Modum eam celebrandi sic describit Durandus (Rational. lib. iv. c. i.), 'Sacerdos, si ex devotione, non ex superstitione, velit totum officium missæ sine sacrificio dicere, accipiat omnes vestes sacerdotales, et missam suo ordine celebret usque ad finem offerendæ, dimittens secreta, quæ ad sacrificium pertinent. Præfationem vero dicere potest, licet in eadem videantur angeli invocari ad consecrationem corporis et sanguinis Christi. De canone vero nihil dicat, sed orationem Dominicam non prætermittat, et quæ ibi sequuntur, sub silentio dicenda, non dicat: calicem vel hostiam non habeat, nec de his, quæ super calicem seu eucharistiam dicuntur vel fiunt, aliquid dicat vel faciat. Potest etiam dicere, 'Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum: et exinde missæ officium suo ordine peragat. Melius est tamen alia omittere.' Hæc autem 'missa nautica' dicitur, ut ait Durantus (lib. ii. de Ritibus Ecclesiæ, c. iv.) ex libro sacerdotali, quia in mari et fluminibus celebrari solebat, in quibus propter motum et agitationem fluctuum vix potest sacrificium offerri sine periculo effusionis. Declamant acriter adversus eam Gulielmus Estius (Orat. xiii. Theologica) et Laurentius Laudmeterus (lib. ii. de Veteri Clerico et Monacho, c. lxxxiv.) qui ambo existimant, paullo ante Guidonem de Monte Rocherii cœpiasse, a quo laudatur et approbatur (Tractat. iv. c. vii. Manipuli Curatorum), quem scripsit an. 1332; sed errant; quia, ut vidimus, jam in usu erat vivente S. Ludovico rege, qui obiit an. 1270, eamque describit Durandus, qui eodem tempore vixit, et Petrus Cantor, qui floruit an. 700, ejusdem meminit in Verbo Abbreviato, c. xxix. ubi ait, 'Missam siccam esse sine gratia et honore consecrationis eucharistiæ, et nihil fidelibus prodessæ.' (P. 390.)

historians tell us, was exhibited by Heliogabalus to his guests. Yet it so prevailed, that, for some time, it was not displeasing to holy and learned men. Gulielmus de Nan-giaco, the monk, in his book of the Actions of St. Lewis, tells how that most religious king, returning from beyond sea into France, had the body of Christ in the ship with him, and there ordered all the whole Divine office and the mass, except the canon, to be daily celebrated. Genebrard commends the same (in his book of the Apostolical Liturgy, c. xxx.), for those that cannot be in the morning at the whole mass; and for those that are at sea; and for the sick; and for any that are buried in the afternoon: to which purpose he says it was used in his time; and he himself was present at Turin (an. 1587), at the funeral of a nobleman, who was buried in the evening with such a mass, sung by a deacon and a subdeacon. Durandus describes the manner of celebrating it in his *Rationale* (lib. iv. c. i.); where he says, "The whole office may be used except the canon, although, in the preface, the angels seem to be invoked to the consecration of the body and blood of Christ." This, Durantus, in his book *De Ritibus* (lib. ii. c. iv.), says, is called 'the seamen's mass,' *missa nautica*, because it was used to be celebrated at sea, and upon the rivers; where, by reason of the motion and agitation of the waves, the sacrifice could hardly be offered without danger of effusion. Estius declaims bitterly against it in his thirteenth theological oration, and Laurentius Laudmeter (lib. ii. *De Veteri Clerico et Monacho*, c. lxxxiv.); who both think it began a little before the time of Guido de Monte Rocherii, who commends and approves it in his book, called *Manipulus Curatorum* (tract. iv. c. vii.), which he wrote an. 1333: but they were mistaken, because, as we have seen, it was in use in the time of King Lewis, the saint, who died an. 1270. And Durandus describes it, who lived at the same time. And Petrus Cantor, who flourished an. 1200, mentions it in his book called, *Verbum Abbreviatum* (c. xxix.), where he says, 'Dry mass is without the grace and moisture of the consecrated eucharist, and profits the faithful nothing.' Bona adds, that now, by the provident care of bishops, he thinks this

abuse is abrogated and destroyed all over the world. But he forgets to tell his reader one thing, which Durantus^b tells us freely out of Navarre,^c that the book called *Liber Sacerdotalis*, where this *missa nautica* is described, was approved by Leo the Tenth; and that St. Antoninus speaks of it as used at Toulouse, by way of funeral office, in the afternoon. By which we may judge how great corruptions may creep into the Church, and then gain the approbation both of their popes and saints, by their own confession. And when it is so, they will never want advocates to plead their cause, and put the face of antiquity upon them. As in this very case, though Bona and others censure this abuse as an innovation, yet Durantus derives its original from the Primitive Church; and tells us, it was practised at Alexandria, in the time of Socrates, because he says,^d “That on Wednesdays and Fridays they had the Scriptures read, and expositions made upon them; and all other things belonging to religious assemblies, except the celebration of the mysteries:” which, indeed, is very true; but altogether foreign to his purpose, unless we shall say, that there can be no prayers, nor sermons, nor psalmody, nor reading the Scriptures, in the Church, but presently it must be called ‘dry mass,’ that is, using the consecration-service without a consecration.

The other corruption, which Bona censures as a detestable abuse, is that which they call *missa bifaciata* and *trifaciata*, which (he says) Petrus Cantor, in the fore-mentioned book, sharply rebukes. For some priests, in his time, had got a trick of throwing many masses into one, saying the mass of the day, or some special mass, as far as the Offertory, and then beginning another as far as the same place; and, after that, a third and a fourth in the same manner. After

^b Durant. de Ritib. lib. ii. c. iv. sect. viii. Exstat liber sacerdotalis a Leone X. ut ait Navarrus, libro de Oratione, miscell. liii. probatus in eo, parte prima, tract. iv. c. xxxiv. &c. . . . Antoninus, part. iii. lib. xiii. c. vi. sect. iv. hanc (missam nauticam) Tolosæ dum post prandium defuncti sepulturæ dantur celebrari consuetum, dixi lib. i. cap. de Cæmeteriis.

^c See preceding note.

^d Socrat. lib. v. c. xxii. Αὐθις ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, τῇ τριτάτῃ, καὶ τῇ λιγομίνῃ Παρασκευῇ γραφαὶ τι ἀναγινώσκονται, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ταῦτα ἐρμηνεύουσι, πάντα τε τὰ συνάξιος γίνεται, δίχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τιλιστῆς. (Cant. 295, 31.)

that, they said as many secret prayers as they had begun masses, and then made one canon serve them all, adding as many collects in the end, as they had repeated in the beginning. Petrus Cantor ascribes the original of this abuse to the covetousness of the priests; who, knowing it to be unlawful for them to celebrate more than once in one day, invented this grafting of many masses upon one stock, that, by once celebrating, they might satisfy the devotion of many together, who desired the sacrifice to be offered for them, by which means they got the pay of several masses for one sacrifice. These masses Petrus Cantor calls by a barbarous name, *bifaciatas* and *trifaciatas*, because they had a 'double' and a 'triple face;' which he abominates and detests as monstrous and contrary to the institution and custom of the Church. It is great pity we have not this book of Petrus Cantor, called his *Verbum Abbreviatum*, or 'short work,' here at hand, in some of our libraries. It is a book so rare, that I find no mention made of it in Dr. Cave. But Du Pin gives a short account of the author. He says,* "He was chanter of the Church of Paris, in the beginning of the thirteenth century; that he composed a book called the 'Word Abridged,' a work of great renown among the authors of the next centuries, of which a part was written against the proprietary monks. He likewise wrote a Grammar for Divines, very necessary for understanding the Scriptures; a Book of Distinctions; a Treatise about some Miracles; three Books of the Sacraments, and divers sermons, mentioned by Trithemius." Du Pin adds, "That in their libraries they had his Glosses upon the Bible, and a Collection of Cases of Conscience." But none of them are printed beside the

* Du Pin, Bibliothec. cent. xiii. p. 54, (p. 59, edit. Gallic. 1700.) Pierre Chantre de l'église de Paris, qui à fleuri et enseigné vers le même tems dans l'université de Paris, à composé un livre, intitulé Parole Abrégée, ouvrage fort célèbre parmi les auteurs de siècles suivans, dont on à imprimé une partie, écrite contre les moines propriétaires. Il avoit aussi composé un autre livre, intitulé la Grammaire des Théologiens, très utile pour l'intelligence de l'écriture: un Traité des Distinctions: un écrit touchant quelque Miracles: trois Livres de Sacramens; et des sermons, dont Trithème fait mention. On trouve dans les bibliothèques de gloses de cet auteur sur les livres de la Bible, et une Somme de Cas de Conscience.

Verbum Abbreviatum. Trithemius says he was a bishop afterwards, as he had heard reported, and he gives him this character,^f "That he was excellently well learned in the Scriptures, and eminent in all philosophical knowledge; that he was rector at the theological school at Paris for many years, where he trained up many eminent disciples." Were his books now to be seen, we might doubtless find many other such abuses of the monks as severely handled in them, as those which we have here noted out of Bona.

Whilst I am upon this head of abuses, the reader will not be displeased, if I note another of this kind, which Baronius himself takes notice of out of the seventeenth Council of Toledo,^g where there is a canon to censure and correct it. Some priests in Spain were so corrupt as to gratify revengeful men by saying the service of the dead for the living, for no other end, but that they for whom the office was said, might incur the danger of death, by having a sacrifice offered for them: and so that which was designed for men's salvation, was perversely abused, at the instigation of wicked men, to their destruction. Against such compliers with the detestable requests of wicked men, the Council pronounces the severe sentence of deposition and excommunication.^h We may also

^f Trithem. de Scriptor. p. 81, (p. 62, b. edit. Basil. 1494.) Petrus Cantor Parisiensis: et postea, ut ferunt, episcopus: vir in Divinis Scripturis eruditissimus, et in sæculari philosophia nobiliter doctus: theologicæ scholæ Parisiensis multis annis gloriose præfuit: et discipulos egregios multos erudit. Scripsit etiam præclara opuscula: de quibus pauca ad manus nostras memini pervenisse. Volumen prænotatum: Verbum Abbreviatum: Distinctionum aliud: Grammaticum Theologorum: sermones varios: de quibusdam miraculis: de sacramentis quoque.

^g Baron. an. 694, n. viii. Succisa est pariter in eodem Concilio (Tolet. XVII.) abusio illa, quæ in sacrosanctum Missæ sacrificium irrepsisset cum superstitione conjuncta; dum scilicet aliquis, adversus inimicum suum odio flagrans, ut ille quam citius ex humanis subduceretur, pro ipso offerret vel offerendum curaret sacrificium, pro defunctis offerri solitum.

^h Conc. Tolet. XVII. c. v. (tom. vi. Conc. p. 1366.) Plerique sacerdotum, qui prædicatores veritatis existere debuerunt, et ex quorum ore universitas plebium legem veritatis debet exquirere, secundum Salomonem, qui dicit, 'Labia sacerdotis custodiunt scientiam, et legem exquirunt de ore ejus; quia angelus Domini est,' ita præpediente delicto, atque sauciati inimicitiae dolo, non solum hominibus fallaciter loqui minime pertimescunt, sed et in sanctis basilicis supra altare Domini, coram Deo idem nequaquam perpetrare horrescunt. Nam

note another abuse mentioned in the twelfth Council of Toledo,ⁱ which was, "That some priests, having occasion to consecrate the eucharist more than once in a day, would not communicate themselves every time, but only at the last consecration." Which was another sort of private mass, but (as it were) the reverse of that of the Romish Church. For as now the priest communicates without the people (pardon the absurdity of the expression, when I call that communicating where there is no communion); so then the people were forced to communicate without the priest: both which the Council thought preposterous and absurd, and therefore reinforces the ancient discipline,—that both priest and people should communicate together: which was ever the constant and universal practice of the whole Primitive Church, to whose laws and rules about communicants, leaving these abuses and innovations, I now return.

*missam pro requie defunctorum promulgatam fallaci voto pro vivis student celebrare hominibus, non ob aliud, nisi ut is, pro quo id ipsum offertur sacrificium, ipsius sacrosancti libaminis interventu, mortis ac perditionis incurrat periculum; et quod cunctis datum est in salutis remedium, illi hoc perverso instinctu quibusdam esse expetunt in interitum. Obinde nostræ elegit unanimi-
tatis conventus, ut si quis sacerdotum deinceps talia perpetrasse fuerit detectus, a proprio deponatur gradu; et tam ipse sacerdos, quam etiam ille, qui ad talia peragenda incitasse perpenditur, exilii perpetui ergastulo religati, excepto in supremo vitæ curricula, cunctis vitæ suæ diebus sacræ communionis eis denegetur perceptio, quam Deo se crediderunt fraudulento delibasse studio.*

ⁱ Conc. Tolet. XII. c. v. (tom. vi. Conc. p. 1230.) Relatum nobis est, quosdam de sacerdotibus, non tot vicibus communionis sanctæ gratiam sumere, quot sacrificia in uno die videntur Deo offerre: sed in uno die, si plurima per se offerant sacrificia, in omnibus se oblationibus a communione suspendunt, et in sola tantum extremi sacrificii oblatione communionis sanctæ gratiam sumunt: quasi non sit totiens reus illius veri et singularis sacrificii, quotiens participator corporis ac sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse destiterit. Nam ecce apostolus dicit, Nonne qui edunt hostias, participes sunt altaris? Si ergo, qui edunt hostias, participes sunt altaris, certum est, quod hi qui sacrificantes non edunt, rei sunt Dominici sacramenti. Quicumque ergo sacerdotum deinceps Divino altario sacrificium oblaturus accesserit, et se a communione suspenderit, ab ipaa, qua se indecenter privabit, gratia communionis, anno uno repulsum se noverit. Nam quale erit illud sacrificium, cui nec ipse sacrificans participasse cognoscitur? Ergo hoc modis omnibus est tenendum, ut quotiescumque sacrificans, corpus et sanguinem Jesu Christi, Domini nostri, in altario immolat, toties perceptionis corporis et sanguinis Christi se participem præbeat. — Confer sis Gratian. de Consecrat. Destinatus. ii. c. x. ubi hic canon repetitur.

SECT. VI.—*The Communion not given to Heretics and Schismatics, without Confession and Reconciliation.*

As all persons were obliged to receive the communion constantly, who were within the pale of the Church, in the largest acceptation of the word, except catechumens and excommunicate persons; so we must note, to avoid ambiguity, that heretics and schismatics were commonly ranked in the same class with excommunicate persons; sometimes being formally cut off from the Church by her censures, and sometimes voluntarily by their own separation; and, therefore, till they had made confession and renunciation of their errors, and were reconciled by imposition of hands and absolution, they were reckoned in the number of those to whom the communion of prayers and this holy sacrament was denied: and that, whether they had been baptized in the Church, or were baptized in heresy and schism. Sometimes they were allowed, with all others, to hear the Scriptures read, and the sermon preached, as has been shewed in a former book:^j but then when the service of the catechumens was over, they were obliged to depart with them; the deacon's admonition commonly running in these terms, as we have often heard before, "Let no catechumen, no penitent, no unbeliever, no heretic, or heterodox person, be present at the holy mysteries." After what manner they were received and reconciled upon their confessions, belongs to another subject; which has, in some measure, been handled already,^k and will come again under consideration in the next volume, when we treat of the discipline of the Church. At present, it is sufficient to observe, that whilst they continued in heresy or schism, they were of the number of those to whom the Church refused to give the sacrament, as persons not being in full communion with her.

^j Book xiii. chap. i. sect. ii. vol. iv. p. 73.

^k Scholast. Hist. of Baptism. part. i. chap. i. n. xxi.

SECT. VII.—*Yet given to Infants and Children, for several Ages.*

On the other hand, it is beyond dispute, that as she baptized infants, and gave them the unction of chrism, with imposition of hands, for confirmation, so she immediately admitted them to a participation of the eucharist, as soon as they were baptized, and ever after without exception. Some evidence has been given of this already, for at least eight centuries, in speaking of confirmation,¹ out of Gennadius and Alcuin, and the *Ordo Romanus*, and *Jesse Ambianensis*, and other public offices of the Church, containing the rules of baptism and confirmation, where orders are also given to communicate infants as soon as they were baptized. Here I will add the testimony of the more ancient writers, that it may not be thought a novelty and invention of latter ages. Cyprian often mentions it as the common practice: in his book of those that lapsed in time of persecution, he speaks of some parents, who took their little children in their arms, when they went to sacrifice at the heathen altars: and he brings in those infants thus complaining;^m “We did nothing ourselves; neither did we leave the bread and cup of the Lord to run, of our own accord, to the profane contagions: it was the treachery of others that destroyed us; we fell by the hands of our parents.” A little further, he speaks of another infant, who was carried by her nurse, unknown to her parents, to the magistrates, to partake of the idol-sacrifice:ⁿ who, when she was brought by her mother

¹ Book xii. chap. i. sect. ii. vol. iv. p. 7.

^m Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 125, (p. 90, edit. Amstelod.) Infantes quoque, parentum manibus vel impositi vel attracti, amiserunt parvuli, quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consequuti. Nonne illi, quum judicii dies venerit, dicent, ‘Nos nihil fecimus,’ &c.

ⁿ Ibid. p. 132, (p. 94, edit. Amstelod.) Parentes forte fugientes dum trepidi minus suis consulunt, sub nutricis alimento parvulam filiam reliquerunt; relictam nutrix detulit ad magistratus. Illi ei apud idolum quo populus confuebat, quod carnem necdum posset edere per ætatem, panem mero mixtum, quod tamen et ipsum de immolatione pereuntium supererat, tradiderunt. Recepit filiam postmodum mater. Sed facinus puella commissum tam loqui et indicare non potuit, quam nec intelligere prius potuit, nec arcere (al. cavere). Ignoracione igitur obreptum est, ut, sacrificantibus nobis eam secum mater inferret. Sed enim

afterwards, to receive the eucharist, vomited up the wine that was given her to drink in the communion. By which it is undeniable, that infants were then admitted to communicate in both kinds, if they were capable of receiving them. Upon this account, the author of the Constitutions,^o in his invitation of the faithful to the communion, bids mothers bring their children with them. And again, describing the order in which they communicated, he says,^p “First let the bishops receive, then the presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, and ascetics; among the women, the deaconesses, virgins, and widows; after that, the children, and then all the people in their order.” The author under the name of Dionysius says the same,^q “That children were admitted not only to baptism, but the eucharist, though they did not understand the reasons of either mystery.” St. Austin not only mentions the practice in Cyprian’s time,^r citing the foresaid passages out of his book *De Lapsis*, but also seems to say it was necessary for infants, in order to obtain eternal life;^s grounding upon that saying of our Saviour (John, vi.),

puella mixta cum sanctis, precis nostræ et orationis impatiens, nunc ploratu concuti, nunc mentis æstu cœpit fluctuabunda jactari, et velut tortore cogente, quibus poterat indiciis conscientiam facti in simplicibus adhuc annis rudis anima fatebatur. Ubi vero solemnibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit, et accipientibus ceteris locus ejus advenit; faciem suam parvula instinctu Divinæ majestatis avertere, os labiis obturantibus premere, calicem recusare. Perstitit tamen diaconus, et reluctanti licet, de sacramento calicis infudit. Tunc sequitur singultus et vomitus. In corpore atque ore violato eucharistia permanere non potuit. Sanctificatus in Domini sanguine potus, de pollutis visceribus erupit.

^o Constitut. lib. viii. c. xii. vol. i. Τὰ παῖδια προσλαμβάνοντι αἱ μητέρες.

^p Ibid. c. xiii. Μιστὰ τοῦτο μεταλαμβάνειν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἕκαστα οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ ὑποδιάκονοι, καὶ οἱ ἀναγνώσται, καὶ οἱ ψάλται, καὶ οἱ ἄσκηται, καὶ ἐν ταῖς γυναῖξιν αἱ διακόνισσαι, καὶ αἱ παρθένοι, καὶ αἱ χῆραι, εἴτα τὰ παῖδια, καὶ τότε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς κατὰ τάξιν.

^q Dionys. Eccles. Hierarch. c. vii. sect. xi. p. 360, (p. 417, edit. Antuerp. 1569.) Τὸ δὲ καὶ παῖδας, εὖσιν τὰ θεία συνίναι δυναμένους, τῆς ἱερᾶς μετόχους γίνεσθαι θιογενισίας, καὶ τῶν ἱερωτάτων τῆς θιαρχικῆς κοινωνίας συμβόλων, δοκῇ μὲν, ὡς φῆς, τοῖς ἀνέροις ἐλλόγου γίλωτος ἄξιον, κ. τ. λ.

^r Aug. Epist. xxiii. ad Bonifac. (tom. ii. opp. p. 90, edit. Basil. 1569.) Quod si sanctus Cyprianus arbitretur, non eorum defensionem continuo subjiceret, dicens, ‘Nonne illi, quum judicii dies venerit, dicent, Nos nihil fecimus,’ &c.

^s Ibid. de Peccator. Merit. lib. i. c. xx. Dominum audiamus, non quidem hoc de sacramento sancti lavacri dicentem, sed de sacramento sanctæ mensæ suæ, quo

“Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you :” “Which,” he says, “is to be understood, not of the sacrament of baptism, but of the sacrament of the Lord’s table, where no one is rightly admitted but he that is baptized. And dare any one be so bold, as to say, that this sentence does not appertain to little children, or that they can have life without partaking of this body and blood?” He repeats the same frequently in his disputes with the Pelagians,[†] and his sermons on the words of the apostle,[‡] and in his Epistle to Boniface,[¶] written jointly by him and Alipius against the Pelagians. And Pope Innocent, his contemporary, seems to have had the same opinion : for he argues, in his epistle to St. Austin, and the Council of Milevis,[‡] for the necessity of baptizing infants, from the necessity of their eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of the Son of man. There is great dispute among the Romish doctors about the sense of St. Austin and this Pope Innocent upon this point. Bona^{*} and others think it would be a great reproach to their Church, to have it thought that the Council of Trent should condemn the opinion of the necessity of communicating infants, whilst two such great men as St. Austin and their own Pope Innocent, were conceived to be of that opinion : and, therefore, they say, though the ancients gave the communion to infants ; yet they did not think it necessary to salvation. This is the salvo which the Council of Trent put into their

nemo rite nisi baptizatus accedit : ‘Nisi manducaveritis,’ &c. An vero quisquam audebit etiam hoc dicere, quod ad parvulos hæc sententia non pertineat, possintque sine participatione corporis hujus et sanguinis in se habere vitam ? (ix. 10, F.)

[†] Aug. cont. Duas Epist. Pelag. lib. i. c. xxii. Nec illud cogitatis, eos vitam habere non posse, qui fuerint expertes corporis et sanguinis Christi, dicente ipso ‘Nisi manducaveritis,’ &c.

[‡] Ibid. Serm. viii. de Verbis Apostoli, p. 110. Infantes sunt, sed mensæ ejus participes fiunt, ut habeant in se vitam.

[¶] Epist. cvi. ad Bonifac. p. 185. Nullus, qui se meminit Catholicæ fidei Christianum, negat aut dubitat, parvulos non accepta gratia regenerationis in Christo, sine cibo carnis ejus et sanguinis potu, non habere in se vitam.

[‡] Innocent. Ep. xcii. inter Epistolas Augustini. Parvulos æternæ vitæ præmiis etiam sine baptismatis gratia donari posse, perfatum est : nisi anim manducaverint sanguinem ejus, non habebunt vitam in sæmptais.

^{*} Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xix. sect. i. tot.

mouths, for having condemned the opinion itself as heretical; yet to bring off the ancient Church, which was known to practise it, she adds:¹ “We do not hereby intend to condemn antiquity for observing this custom in some places. For as those holy fathers had a probable reason, considering the state of the times they lived in, for their practice; so it is certainly, and without all controversy, to be believed, that they did not do it upon any opinion of its being necessary to salvation.” But Maldonat would not take the Council’s word for this: for, without any regard to their interpretation or authority, he asserts roundly:² “That the ancients, and particularly St. Austin and Pope Innocent, did believe, that infants could not be saved without partaking of the eucharist; and that they were induced to believe this by those words of our Saviour, ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.’” And indeed any one that reads, but with half an eye, the testimonies of St. Austin now alleged (which Bona thought fit to conceal from his reader, only making a short reference to some of them), may easily perceive what was his opinion in the matter. And it were absurd to think, that the whole Primitive Church, Greek and Latin, from St. Cyprian’s time, should give the communion to infants, without imagining any manner of necessity from any Divine command to do it. But Bona endeavours to support his and the Council’s sense, from the authority of Fulgentius, who was one of St. Austin’s disciples, and who, as he represents him, says, “That actual communion after baptism, is not necessary to salvation.” But he only abuses his reader with a false state of the case, and a false assertion grounded on it. For Fulgentius does not say that the actual participation of the eucharist is not necessary, after baptism, for infants. For he is not speaking of infants, but adult persons, who die as soon as they are baptized, without having opportunity to receive the com-

¹ Conc. Trident. Sess. xxi. c. iv. Neque ideo tamen damnanda est antiquitas, si eum morem in quibusdam locis servavit. Ut enim sanctissimi illi patres sui facti probabilem causam pro illius temporis ratione habuerunt; ita certe eos nulla salutis necessitate id fecisse sine controversia credendum est.

² Maldonat. Comment. in Joan. vi. 53, pp. 316, 317.

munion: concerning whom he concludes favourably, that though they die before they receive outwardly the elements of bread and wine, yet they are not to be despaired of, because they were made partakers of the body and blood of Christ in baptism: which, in such cases of great necessity,^a was sufficient to answer the end of the communion, when men were desirous of it, but had no opportunity to receive it. So that he believed the eucharist, ordinarily, to be necessary both for infants and adult persons; but, in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, not to be necessary for either.

But to set aside the question of right, and only pursue matter of fact, we find that this custom continued even in the Roman Church for many ages: Maldonat says for six centuries; but Bona makes it double the number: for, he says, it was not abrogated in France till the twelfth century. In Gregory's *Sacramentarium*^b there is an order concerning infants, that they should be allowed to suck the breast before the holy communion, if necessity so required. And the old *Ordo Romanus*,^c a book composed in the ninth century, has a direction to the same purpose, "That infants, after they were baptized, should not eat any food, nor suck the breast, without great necessity, till they had communicated in the sacrament of the body of Christ." So Alcuin, or whoever wrote under his name, in the time of Charles the Great, says,^d "The order then was, that when infants were baptized, they were immediately confirmed by the bishop, if he

^a Fulgent. de Baptismo Æthiopis, c. xi. p. 611. Nullus debet moveri fidelium in illis, qui etsi legitime sana mente baptizantur, præveniente velocius morte, carnem Domini manducare, et sanguinem bibere non sinuntur, propter illam videlicet sententiam Salvatoris, qua dixit, 'Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis,' &c. Quod quisquis . . . mysterii veritatem considerare poterit, in ipso lavacro sanctæ regenerationis hoc fieri providebit.

^b Gregor. Sacram. Offic. Sabbati Sancti. Non prohibentur lactari aut sacram communionem, si necesse fuerit.

^c Ordo Rom. Bibl. Patr. tom. x. p. 84, edit. Paris. 1654. De parvulis providendum, ne postquam baptizati fuerint, ullum cibum accipiant, neque lactentur sine summa necessitate, antequam communicent sacramento corporis Christi.

^d Alcuin. de Offic. cap. de Sabbato Sancto, ibid. p. 259, citat. edit. Si episcopus adest, statim confirmari oportet chrismate, et postea communicare: et si episcopus deest, communicentur a presbytero. . . . Sed et hoc providendum est, ut nullum cibum accipiant, neque lactentur, antequam communicent.

were present, and admitted to communicate; but, if the bishop was absent, they should receive the communion from the presbyter." Baluzius^e alleges two manuscript pontificals of the same age, which have rubrics to the same purpose; and the orders of Jesse, bishop of Amiens,^f call it confirming children with the body and blood of Christ, as they were confirmed before with imposition of hands and chrism. And it is remarkable of Walter, bishop of Orleans, in the same age, that among his synodical rules there is one to this purpose,^g "That a presbyter shall always have the eucharist ready by him, that in case any one be infirm, or a young child sick, he may give him the communion, and not let him die without his *viaticum*, or 'provision for his journey' into the next world." The second Council of Mascon, which was held an. 588, and the third Council of Tours^h in the time of Charles the Great, order the remains of the eucharist to be given to innocent children. Radulphus Ardens, who lived in the beginning of the twelfth century, speaks of it still as the custom to give little children the sacrament,ⁱ at least in the species of wine, immediately after they were baptized, that they might not go without the necessary sacra-

^e Baluz. Not. in Reginonem, lib. i. c. lxix.

^f Jesse Ambian. Epist. de Ordine Bapt. ap. Baluz. ibid. Episcopus puerum chrismate confirmet; novissime autem corpore ac sanguine Christi confirmetur seu communicetur, ut Christi membrum esse possit.

^g Walter. Aurelian. Capit. c. vii. (tom. viii. Conc. p. 639.) Idem habetur apud Ansegisum abbatem, de Legibus Francorum, lib. i. c. clv. al. clxi. Semper eucharistiam presbyter habeat paratam, ut quando quis infirmatus fuerit, aut parvulus ægrotaverit, statim eum communicet, ne sine viatico moriatur.

^h Conc. Matiscon. II. c. vi. (tom. v. Conc. p. 982.) Quæcumque reliquiæ sacrificiorum post peractam missam in sacrario supersederint, quarta vel sexta feria innocentes ab illo, cujus interest, ad ecclesiam adducantur, et indicto eis jejunio, easdem reliquias conspersas vino percipiant. — Cone. Turon. III. c. xix. (tom. vii. p. 1264.) Presbyteri omnino admonendi sunt, ut cum sacra missarum solemniam peregerint, atque communicaverint, pueris aut aliis quibuslibet personis adstantibus corpus Domini indiscrete non tribuant. Qui si forte majoribus peccatis fuerint irretiti, magis sibi damnationem quam remedium comparant, juxta sententiam apostoli, dicentis, 'Quicumque manducaverit panem, vel biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Probet autem se ipsum homo, et sic de pane illo edat, et de calice bibat.'

ⁱ Radulph. Sermon. in die Paschæ de Eucharistiæ Necessitate. Statutum est, ut pueris mox baptizatis saltem in specie vini tradatur, ne sine necessario sacramento discedant.

ment. And Hugh de St. Victor, at the same time, recommends the giving of it to children,^k if it might be done without danger; though he intimates the custom was now almost generally laid aside, there being only a mere form and shadow of it remaining, which was to give children newly-baptized common wine instead of consecrated; which he thinks a superfluous rite, that ought to be laid aside. And so it was not long after: for Odo, bishop of Paris (an. 1175), ordered, that neither consecrated nor unconsecrated bread should, by any means, be given to little children.^l And so, says Bona,^m “The custom of giving the communion to infants was superseded, in the twelfth age, in the Gallican Church.” It continued a little longer in Germany, if Suicerus does not mistakeⁿ in his author: for he quotes Joannes Semeca, surnamed Teutonicus, who wrote the gloss upon Gratian, as saying, “That the custom prevailed in some places, in his time, to give the eucharist to children.” But there is no such gloss in the place,^o he alleges, in the Roman edition; so that either he mistakes the place, or else some fraud has been used to expunge the passage by the Roman correctors. Zuinglius speaks of the custom continuing long among the Helvetians; for, he says, in the ritual book of Claron, called their Obsequial, there was this rubric:^p “That a newly-baptized child should have the eucharist in both kinds ministered unto him.” And Hos-

^k Hugo de S. Victore, de Sacram. lib. i. c. xx. Vid. Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xix. sect. ii.

^l Odo Statut. Synod. c. xxxix. Vid. Bon. ibid.

^m Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xix. sect. ii. Sic desiit in Gallicana ecclesia, sæculo xii., mos pueros communicandi.

ⁿ Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 1138. Joannes etiam Teutonicus, qui scholia scripsit in Gratianum, (de Consecrat. Distinct. iv. c. iv.) testatur, eam quibusdam in locis consuetudinem sua ætate adeo invaluisse, ut sacramentum infantibus darent.

^o Gratian. de Consecrat. Distinct. iv. c. iv. citatus etiam ab Hospiniano.

^p Zuingl. Explanat. Articuli. xviii. tom. i. Oper. p. 34, edit. Tigur. 1581. Quum minister essem apud Claronam Helvetiorum, librum ibidem reperi (‘Obsequiale’ vocant pontificii) in Mollis vetustissimum, sed integrum adhuc, et nulla parte, quod ad litteras attinet, vitiatum. Titulus erat (‘Rubricam’ vocant) in eo loco, quo de ritu baptizandi præscribit, hujusmodi verbis scriptus, ‘Baptizato puero mox detur eucharistiæ sacramentum.’ Similiter poculum sanguinis.

pinian assures us, from his own knowledge,^a that in Lorraine, and the adjacent parts, it was usual for the priest, when he had baptized a child, to dip his fingers in the cup, and drop the wine into the child's mouth, saying, "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be of advantage unto thee to eternal life."

The Greek Church was a little more tenacious of the ancient custom: for not only Basilius Cilix,^r and Evagrius,^s and Joannes Moschus,^t mention the communion of children, and the giving the remains of the eucharist to children, after the communion was ended; but also Nicephorus, who lived in the fourteenth century,^u mentions the same. And Suicerus tells us, out of Metrophanes Critopulus, a modern Greek writer,^v that they still continue to observe the custom to this day. As he also observes, out of Osorius

^a Hospin. Hist. Sacram. lib. ii. c. ii. p. 60, (p. 51, edit. Genev. 1681.) Ante paucos adhuc annos consuetudinis hujus in Lotharingia et vicinia exstiterunt reliquiae aliquae. Nam ubi baptizatus est illic infans, sacrificulus, qui illum baptizavit, e sacratio acceptam capsulam, in qua sacramentum adservatur, ad altare detulit, et hostiam, ut vocant, unam ostentavit populo: deinde in capsulam reposuit; et duos digitos, quibus eam prehenderat, vino lavandos porrexerat aeterno, et ex illo vino distillavit in os baptizati infantis, dicens, 'Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi tibi in vitam aeternam proficiat.'

^r Basil. ap. Photium, cod. cvii. p. 281. Scripsit contra Joannem Scythopolitanum, et de eo narrat: Οὐδὲ πω ἱκονῶντι τῆς ἱερουργίας τελειομένης· ἀλλὰ μιτὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον παισὶν ἅμα τῶν μυστηρίων μιταλάμεναι, καὶ παραντίκα πρὸς τὴν σφάπριζαν ἀπίσφιχι.

^s Evagr. lib. iv. c. xxxvi. (Cant. 416, 20.) "Ἐθος παλαιὸν βούλινται ἀνὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν, ὅτ' ἐν πολλοῖς τί χρεῖμα τῶν ἁγίων μερίδων τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἱναπομῖναι, παιδας ἀφόρους μιταπύμπτους γίγινεσθαι παρὰ τῶν ἐς χαμαιδιδασκάλου φοιτῶντων, καὶ ταῦτα κατισθῖναι.

^t Mosch. Viridar. c. cxevi. (tom. ii. Bibl. Patr. Gr.-Lat. p. 1151.) 'Ἡ συνήθεια ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ περιδραμεν, ὅστις τοὺς παιδας ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἁγίου ἱερατικοῦ ἴστασθαι ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις συνάξεσιν, καὶ πρῶτους μιτὰ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τῶν ἁγίων μιταλαμῶμεναι μυστηρίων.

^u Nicephor. lib. vii. c. xlv. "Ἐθος κινεῖσθαι ἐκ πολλοῦ τῇ βασιλίδι τῶν πόλεων, ὡς ἱσχυρὰν πολὺ τι τῶν μερίδων τοῦ ἀχράντου καὶ Θεοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἱναπολιθῇ, μιταστῖλλεσθαι τοὺς ἱερεῖς παιδας ἀφόρους ἐκ τῶν ἐς χαμαιδιδασκάλου φοιτῶντων, καὶ ταύτας νήστεις ἰσθῖναι· ὃ δὴ καὶ ἱμοὶ πολλάκις νωτὶφ κομιδῇ γινώσκω ἱσθῖναι.

^v Suicer. tom. ii. p. 1138. — Metrophanes Critopulus (in Confess. Eccles. Oriental. c. ix. p. 98,) postquam dixisset, panem et calicem, tam ecclesiasticos quam laicos accipere, statim subjicit: 'Ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ βρεῖθη, ἀρξάμενα εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, μιτίχῃ τοῦ λοιποῦ, ὁσῶν οἱ γονεῖς βούλονται. — Et mox: "Ὡσπερ δὲ τὰ νήπια βαπτίζεσθαι, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ Κυριακοῦ δίσκου μιτίχῃν.

De Gestis Emmanuelis (lib. ix.), that it continues to be the practice of the Æthiopic or Abyssin Churches; and he cites Sigismundus Baro's History of Muscovy, for the same in the Russian Churches. Mr. Brerewood^x notes the like of the Russian Churches, out of Guaguinus. And Dr. Smith^y tells, for the present Greek Church, that they give the eucharist, in both kinds, to little children of one or two years of age, and sometimes to new-born infants, after baptism, in case of imminent danger of death; grounding their belief of an absolute necessity of this sacrament upon the words of our Saviour (John, vi. 53), "Except ye eat the flesh," &c., and pleading the practice of the Primitive Church in their own justification. I have not said any thing of all this to reduce the custom into practice again (though Bishop Bedell, and some others, have declared entirely for it); because, as learned men^z have shewed, there are good reasons to persuade the contrary: 1. Because it has no firm foundation in the word of God. 2. Because infants, which are baptized, are, in effect, thereby partakers of the body and blood of Christ, which are exhibited spiritually in baptism as well as the eucharist, according to St. Austin himself, and all the ancient fathers, of which I have made full proof in another place.^a 3. Because infants cannot do this in remembrance of Christ, which he requires all that partake in this sacrament, to do. 4. Because there is the same analogy and agreement between the paschal lamb and the Lord's supper, as there is between circumcision and baptism. An infant Israelite had a right to enter the covenant by circumcision, as it was the seal of it; but he was not to partake of the

^x Brerewood's Enquiries, chap. xviii. p. 136.

^y If it be objected against them, that these words are not to be understood of a sacramental manducation; and that the custom which they retain, seems to be so far from being necessary, that it is scarce proper and justifiable, children not possibly having any actual faith or understanding of these mysteries; they will appeal, for their justification, to the universal practice of the Church, in the primitive times, for several ages; wherein the communicating of infants was looked upon as a necessary and essential point of the Christian religion.—Smith, p. 161. London, 1680.

^z Vid. Hospinian. et Suicer. locis citatis.

^a Book xi. chap. x. sect. iv.

passover, till he could ask his parents the meaning of the mystery. (Exod. xii. 26.) So an infant may enter the Christian covenant by baptism, but not partake regularly of the eucharist, till he can do it in remembrance of Christ. What I have, therefore, discoursed upon this head, by deducing the matter historically from first to last, is rather to shew the vanity of that pretence to infallibility and unerring tradition, in the Church of Rome, in matters of doctrine and necessary practice; since they themselves have thought fit to alter one point, which their infallible popes and forefathers, for so many ages, observed as necessary, in communicating infants upon a Divine command; and withal to shew, that any other Church has a better pretence than they, to reform any practice, however generally observed, if, upon better examination, it be found not to be grounded upon a good foundation in the word of God. I now return to the business of the ancient Church.

SECT. VIII. — *Sent to the absent Members of their own, or other Churches.*

Where we find, that not only the present members were all communicants, but they that were absent, had it sent to them by the hands of a deacon, to testify, that while they were absent upon any lawful occasion, they were still reputed to be in the communion of the Church. Thus Justin Martyr says,^b “The same eucharist, which was received by them that were present, was carried by the deacons to the absent;” for, as they prayed for those that were absent upon a probable or reasonable cause, so they allowed them to communicate in the same sacrament also. Upon this account, as we have seen before,^{bb} the eucharist at Rome, in the time of Melchiades, Spiricius, and Innocent, was usually sent from the bishop’s church to the *tituli*, or ‘lesser churches,’ for the presbyters, ministering in those churches, to communicate

^b Justin. Martyr. Apol. ii. p. 98. Καὶ ἡ διὰδοσις καὶ ἡ μετέληψις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐυχαιριστηθέντων ἐκείσθῃ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πρέμνεται.

—Vid. Ibid. Novel. cxliii. c. xxxvi. “Ἡ τὴν ἁγίαν αὐταῖς κοινωνίαν φέρειν.

^{bb} See before, chap. ii. sect. v.

with him, and, as some think,^c for the whole congregations also: for they suppose, that at first there was but one altar in a city, and that at the mother Church, where the bishop ministered, and consecrated the eucharist, and sent it thence to the lesser congregations: and so they understand even that passage in Justin Martyr. I rather think, the presbyters had the privilege to consecrate the eucharist in their own churches; but, however, a portion of the eucharist was, for all that, sent them by the bishop from his own church, to testify that they were in communion with him. He did not send to the country churches, because the sacraments were not to be carried to places at too great a distance, as Innocent words it in his letter to Decentius: yet, in case of testifying their communion with foreign bishops, they were wont to send it to far distant churches. As Irenæus, in his epistle to Pope Victor,^d when he menaced the Asiatic Churches with excommunication for their different way of observing Easter, tells him, his predecessors never thought of such rough proceedings against them; but, notwithstanding this difference, always sent them the eucharist, to testify their communion with them. Valesius,^e and others, observe the same in the Acts^f of Lucian the martyr, and Paulinus's Epistle to Severus.^g This was chiefly, if not solely, done at the paschal festival, in token of their unity, love, and charity. But the Council of Laodicea,^h for some inconveniences attending the practice, absolutely forbade it; ordering, that the holy sacraments should not be sent from one diocess to another, under the notion of *eulogiæ*, or

^c Maurice, of Diocesan Episcopacy, p. 39.

^d Apud Euseb. lib. v. c. xxiv. Αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσι, ἱεμίπον εὐχαριστίαν.

^e Vales. in loc. Illustre hujus moris exemplum exstat in Actis Luciani martyris.

^f Acta Luciani, ap. Metaphrast. 7 Januar.

^g Paulin. Epist. i. ad Sever. Panem Companum de cellula nostra tibi pro Eulogia misimus, tantum meritis in Domino tuis freti, ut plena ad te perferendum sui gratia crederemus; tu, licet uberioribus micis a Domini mensa jam saturatus sis, dignare et a peccatoribus acceptum in nomine Domini panem in Eulogiam vertere.

^h Conc. Laodic. c. xiv. Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ τὰ ἅγια εἰς λόγον εὐλογιῶν κατὰ τὴν ἰερτὴν τοῦ πάσχα, εἰς ἑτέρας παροικίας διαπίμπασθαι.

'benedictions,' at the Easter festival. Yet, in some places, the custom continued for several ages after, for Joannes Moschus¹ speaks of the communion being sent from one monk to another, at six miles distance; not to mention again the custom of sending the eucharist by Paulinus, and the bishops of Rome, from the mother Church, to all the other churches throughout the city, in every region. But where they left off this custom of sending the eucharist, they introduced another way of testifying their mutual love and amity to one another by certain symbols of bread, which they blessed and sanctified also in imitation of the eucharist, but with a different benediction; and to these, also, they gave the names of *eulogiæ* and *panis benedictus*, 'consecrated bread;' which the modern Greeks call *ἀντίδωρα*, 'vicarious gifts,' because they were given, in many cases, instead of the eucharist. It has been observed already,¹ that they were given to such as would not communicate, when the ancient fervour of popular and general communions began to decay. Here we are to observe, that they were used to be sent from one country to another, instead of the eucharist, as testimonies of their amity and affection. Some, not improbably,^k thus understood that canon of the Council of Laodicea,¹ which forbids any to receive the *eulogiæ*, or 'blessings' of heretics, which were to be reckoned curses and absurdities rather than blessings. As also that other canon,^m which forbids them to receive either from Jews or heretics τὰ πιμπόμενα ἱεραστικά, such 'gifts or presents as were used to be sent in festivals.' Of this kind was that bread which Pau-

¹ Mosch. Prat. Spiritual. c. xxix. Quasi triginta milliaribus ab Ægina civitate Ciliciæ Stylitæ duo erant, separati ab invicem sex millibus passuum. . . . Ille, divinitus inspiratus, petiit ab eo, ut partem sibi mitteret communionis suæ.

^j See before in this chapter, sect. ii.

^k Habert. Archierat. part. xi. observat. iii. Ut ad Græcorum ritus oculos adjiciamus, fuerunt apud eos eulogiæ etiam duplices, privatæ et publicæ. De privatis præsertim agitur c. xxxvii. Conc. Laodic. Οὐ δι' παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, κ. τ. λ. . . . et revera c. xxxi. clare: Οὐ δι' αἱρετικῶν, κ. τ. λ.

¹ Conc. Laodic. c. xxxi. al. xxxii. Οὐ δι' αἱρετικῶν εὐλογίας λαμβάνειν, αἱ τινὲς εἰσιν ἀλογίαι μᾶλλον ἢ εὐλογίαι.

^m Ibid. c. xxxvii. Οὐ δι' παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἢ αἱρετικῶν τὰ πιμπόμενα ἱεραστικά λαμβάνειν.

linusⁿ and Therasia sent to St. Austin, as a testimony of their unanimity and cordial affection, which they desire him to bless by his acceptance. Some learned men mistake when they say the sending of the eucharist came in the room of this, for it was plainly the reverse. These *eulogiæ* were invented in the room of the eucharist, as appears from the testimony of Irenæus, which speaks of sending the eucharist as the more ancient custom.

SECT. IX. — *And to those that were Sick, or in Prison, or under any Confinement, or in Penance, at the Point of Death.*

Among the absent members of the Church, they had a more especial regard to those that were sick, or in prison, or under any confinement, as the martyrs and confessors, who daily expected their dissolution; and such also of the penitents as were seized with sickness, and in imminent danger of death. To all these, they commonly sent the eucharist; which, in this case, is more peculiarly styled the *ἐφῶδιον*, or *viaticum*, their preparation or ‘provision for their journey’ into the next world. Thus, in the Council of Nice,^o there is a canon, which orders, that all penitents should have their necessary and final *ἐφῶδιον*, or *viaticum*, when they were at the point of death. Which, though Albaspinæus^p interpret only of absolution, yet all others, with better reason, understand it of the eucharist; because it is added in the end of the canon, that the bishop shall impart the oblation to them. And so the Council of Agde says,^q “The *viaticum* shall not be denied to any penitents at the point of

ⁿ Paulin. Ep. xxxi. inter Epist. Aug. Panem unum, quem unanimatis indicio misimus Caritati tuæ, rogamus accipiendo benedicas. — Vid. Aug. Epist. xxxiv. ad Paulin. fin. Panis quem misimus, uberior benedictio fiet, dilectione accipientis vestræ benignitatis. (ii. 44.)

^o Conc. Nic. c. xiii. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 36.) “Ὅστι εἴ τις ἐφῶδιον, τοῦ τιλιουαίου καὶ ἀναγκασιότατον ἐφῶδιον μὴ ἀποστρεψέσθαι.

^p Albaspin. in loc. ibid. p. 82. B. Sententia hujus canonis hæc est, in morte penitenti absolutionem negari non debere.

^q Conc. Agath. c. xv. (tom. iv. Conc. p. 1386.) Pœnitentes . . . si comas non deposuerint, aut vestimenta non mutaverint, abjiciantur; et nisi digne pœnituerint, non recipiantur. . . . Viaticum tamen omnibus in morte positus non negandum.

death." The first Council of Vaison^r makes a provision for such penitents as were snatched away by sudden death, without the *viaticum* of the sacrament, whilst they were preparing for it; that their oblations should be received, and their funerals and memorials celebrated according to the rites of the Church. And the eleventh Council of Toledo^s makes another provision for such, as, by reason of extreme weakness, could not take the whole *viaticum* of the communion, nor swallow the bread, but only drink the cup; that since this proceeded not from any infidelity, but from mere infirmity, they should not be cut off from the body of the Church. The fourth Council of Carthage mentions it in several canons, and in one canon particularly^t speaks of a very remarkable case, which sometimes happened, that a penitent, who desired to be admitted to penance in time of sickness, was sometimes suddenly taken speechless, or turned delirious by the paroxysm of his distemper, before the priest could come to him: in which case, if they that heard him, could testify his desire, he was to be admitted; and if it was thought he would immediately die, he was to be recon-

^r Conc. Vasens. I. al. II. c. ii. (tom. iii. Conc. p. 1457.) Pro his, qui pœnitentia accepta, in bonæ vitæ cursu satisfactoria compunctione viventes, sine communione inopinato nonnumquam transitu, in agris aut itineribus præveniuntur, oblationem recipiendam, et eorum funera, ac deinceps memoriam ecclesiastico adfectu prosequendam; quia nefas est eorum commemorationes excludi a salutaribus sacris, qui ad eadem sacra fideli adfectu contententes, dum se diutius reos statuunt, indignos salutaris mysteriis judicant, ac dum purgatiores restitui desiderant, absque sacramentorum viatico intercipiuntur: quibus fortasse nec absolutissimam reconciliationem sacerdos denegandam putasset.

^s Conc. Tolet. XI. c. xi. (tom. vi. Conc. p. 552.) Solet humanæ naturæ infirmitas in ipso mortis exitu prægravata, tanto siccitatis pondere deprimi, ut nullis ciborum illationibus refici; sed vix tantumdem illati delectetur poculi gratia sustentari. Quod etiam in multorum exitu vidimus, qui optatum suis votis sacre communionis expetentes viaticum, collatam sibi a sacerdote eucharistiam rejecerunt; non quod infidelitate hoc agerent, sed quod præter Domini calicis haustum, traditam sibi non possent eucharistiam deglutire. Non ergo hujusmodi a corpore ecclesiæ separandi sunt, qui talia non infidelitate, sed necessitate fecerunt; præsertim hi, de quibus nihil fidei sinistra sentitur.

^t Conc. Carth. IV. c. lxxvi. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 1206.) Is qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit, oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit, vel in phrenesin versus fuerit, dent testimonium, qui eum audierunt, et accipiat pœnitentiam. Et si continuo creditur moriturus, reconcilietur per manus impositionem, et infundatur ori ejus eucharistia.

ciled by imposition of hands, and then the eucharist was to be poured into his mouth: which is called the *viaticum* of the eucharist,^u in the two following canons; as it is also in the Council of Orange,^x and Gironne,^y and many other places. The eucharist, in these cases, was commonly carried and delivered by a presbyter or a deacon, as has been noted out of Justin Martyr. Yet in cases of great necessity it might be carried and given by any other, as appears from that case in Eusebius,^z related out of an epistle of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, to Fabian, bishop of Rome, where he tells of one Serapion, who, having sacrificed in time of persecution, could not die till he had sent for the presbyter to reconcile him. But the presbyter, being sick, sent him a small portion of the eucharist by the hands of the messenger that came for him, giving him orders to dip it first, and put it into his mouth; which he had no sooner done, but the man gave up the ghost in peace. But this was forbidden by the canons,^a in ordinary cases.

^u Conc. Carth. IV. c. lxxvii. Pœnitentes, qui in infirmitate sunt, viaticum accipiant.—Can. lxxviii. Pœnitentes, qui in infirmitate viaticum acceperint, non se credant absolutos sine manus impositione, si supervixerunt.

^x Conc. Araus. I. c. iii. (tom. iii. Conc. p. 1448.) Qui recedunt de corpore, pœnitentia accepta, placuit sine reconciliatoria manus impositione eis communicari, quod morientis sufficit consolationi, secundum definitiones patrum, qui hujusmodi communionem congruenter viaticum nominarunt.

^y Conc. Gerund. c. ix. (tom. iv. Conc. p. 1569.) Is, qui ægritudinis languore depressus pœnitentiæ benedictionem (quam viaticum deputamus) per communionem acceperit, &c.

^z Euseb. lib. vi. c. xlv. (Cant. 317, 4.) Δίδομαι, σπένδω, καὶ με θῶτον ἀπολύσας· τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μοι τινὰ κάλῃσον· καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἦν ἄφωνος. Ἰδραμὶν ὁ παῖς ἐπὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον· νύξ δι' ἣν κἀκείνος ἡσθίεν· ἀφικίσθαι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἰδυνήθη· . . . βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἐπίδωκεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ, ἀποδρίξαι κελύσας· καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστάξαι. Ἰωανῆκεν ὁ παῖς φέρον· . . . ἀπὸ βρεθίνος ὁ παῖς, καὶ ἅμα τε ἐνίχκει τῷ στόματι· καὶ μικρὸν κίπινος καταβροχθίσας, εὐθὺς ἀπὶδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.

^a Vid. Gratian. de Consecrat. dist. ii. c. cxix. Ex Conc. Rhemensi, c. ii. Pervenit ad notitiam nostram, quod quidam presbyteri in tantum parvi pendant Divina mysteria, ut laico vel feminæ sacrum corpus Domini tradant ad deferendum infirmis: et quibus prohibetur, ne sacrarium ingrediantur, nec ad altare appropinquent, illis sancta sanctorum committuntur. Quod quam sit horribile, quamque detestabile, omnium religiosorum animadvertit prudentia. Igitur interdicit per omnia synodus, ne talis temeraria præsumtio ulterius fiat, sed omnimodis presbyter per se ipsum infirmum communicet. Quod si aliter fecerit, gradus sui periculo subiacebit.

SECT. X.— *The Eucharist sometimes consecrated in Private Houses for these Purposes.*

Sometimes, indeed, they used private consecrations of the eucharist in the houses of sick men, or in prisons, to answer these pious ends and purposes: but most commonly they reserved some small portion of it in the Church, from time to time, for this use, as most expeditious and convenient for sudden accidents and emergencies. There are very ancient instances and examples of both kinds. Cyprian speaks of private consecrations made in prisons for the martyrs and confessors, in time of persecution. For he gives orders,^b “That neither should the people visit them *glomeratim*, ‘in great multitudes,’ to raise envy; nor the presbyters, who went to offer the eucharist with them, go more than one at once, and that by turns, accompanied only with a single deacon, to decline envy and observation.” There is nothing more certain than that, in times of persecution, the Christians performed all Divine offices in every place whither necessity drove them. Every place was then a temple, as Dionysius of Alexandria words it in Eusebius,^c for them to hold religious assemblies in, whether it were a field, or a wilderness, or a ship, or an inn, or a prison. Lucian’s prison was his church; and his own breast his altar to consecrate the eucharist upon,^d for himself and those that were with him in

^b Cyprian. Epist. v. ad Cler. p. 11, (p. 176, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Etsi fratres, pro dilectione sua, cupidi sunt ad conveniendum et visitandum confesso- res bonos, quos illustravit jam gloriosis initiis divina dignatio, tamen caute hoc, et non glomeratim, nec per multitudinem simul junctam, puto esse faciendum: ne ex hoc ipso invidia concitetur, et introëundi aditus denegetur: et dum insatiabiles multum volumus, totum perdamus. Consulite ergo et provideite, ut cum temperamento hoc agi tutius possit: ita ut presbyteri quoque, qui illic apud confesso- res offerunt, singuli cum singulis diaconis per vices alternent: quia et mutatio personarum et vicissitudo convenientium minuit invidiam.

^c Apud Euseb. lib. vii. c. xxii. Πᾶς ὁ τῆς καθ' ἑκαστον θλίψεως τόπος, παθηγουμένων ἡμῖν γένοιτο χωρίον· ἀγρός· ἐρημία· ναῦς· πανδοχείον· διαμονήριον.

^d Vita Luciani ap. Philostorg. lib. ii. c. xiii. (Cant. 484, 3.) “Οτι τὸν μέγιστον Δουκιανὸν φησι μίλλοντα τελευτῆν, καὶ μήτε ναὶν μήτε θυσιαστήριον τῆς τυραννικῆς βίας παριχοῦσης, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἀντικεινίσθαι τῶν διωγῶν καὶ πληγῶν συγχωρούντων, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ στήνῃ ἀνακαίμενον τὴν φρικτὴν θυσίαν τελεσάμενον, οὕτω τε αὐτὸν μισασχέειν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μεταλαβεῖν τοῦ ἀχρεάντου θύματος ἐπιτρέψαι· ἰταλίσθη δὲ ἡ ἱερωργία ἐν τῇ ἐκκλῆσῃ, τοῦ κυκλώσαντος αὐτὸν ἱεροῦ χαροῦ ὡς ἦδη ἀποδιδούonta,

confinement. In such a case, Tertullian says,^e “Three were enough to make a church, when necessity would not allow them a greater number.” It is as evident private consecrations were made in private houses upon the account of sickness. St. Ambrose was thus invited to offer the sacrifice in a private house at Rome, as we are told by the writer of his Life.^f And Paulinus, bishop of Nola, is said to have ordered an altar to be prepared for himself in his chamber, where he consecrated the eucharist, in his sickness, not many hours before his death.^g Thus Gregory Nazianzen tells us,^h that his father consecrated it in his own chamber; and that his sister Gorgoniaⁱ had a domestic altar. Therefore we have no dispute with Bona upon this point; nor should we have any with his Church, if this were all that were meant by private mass in the Roman communion. The reader may hence observe the mistake of those learned men, who assert,^k that the primitive fathers, though passionately indulgent towards their sick brethren, in granting them their spiritual *viaticum*, yet always took a care that the elements should be consecrated in the Church: for the instances that have been given, both concerning the martyrs and the sick, are undeniable evidence to the contrary. And there want not some instances of private consecrations upon other occasions. Such as that mentioned by St. Austin in a

ἐκκλησίας σχῆμα καὶ ἀσφάλειαν τοῦ μὴ καθαρῶσθαι τὰ δρώμενα παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβούντων ἀναπληρῶντες.

^e Tertul. de Fuga, c. xiv. (p. 543, C. 1.) Non potes discurrere per singulos, sit tibi et in tribus ecclesia.

^f Paulin. Vit. Ambros. Per idem tempus, quum trans Tiberim apud quemdam clarissimum invitaretur, ut sacrificium in domo offerret, &c.

^g Uranius, Vit. Paulin.

^h Nazianz. Orat. xix. de Laud. Patris, p. 305, B. “Ὁς ὡς βακτηρίῳ τῇ χειρῶν γιγῇ χρησάμενος, μιμῆσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους Μωϋσίου, καὶ τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ χεῖρας ὡς ἐκτὸς σχηματίσας, συντελεῖ προθύμως ἢ προτελεῖ τοῦ λαοῦ τὰ μυστήρια, ῥήματα μὲν ἐλάλῃ, καὶ ὅσους ἴσθιν, διανοίᾳ δὲ, ὡς ἡμεῖς δοκεῖ, καὶ λίαν τιμωτάτῃ· ἢ τοῦ θαύματος! ἢ τοῦ βήματος, ἐπὶ βήματος, ἢ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου θύτης, ἢ τοῦ πύργου τῶν τελευτῶντων.”

ⁱ Nazianz. Orat. xi. de Gorgonia, p. 187, A. Τῇ θυσιαστηρίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἱερωτικῆς προεδρίας, μετὰ τῆς ἰσθμῆς βοῆς, καὶ δάκρυσι τοῦτο πλουσίως, ὥστε τις πάλαι τοὺς πύδας Χριστοῦ καταβρέχουσα, καὶ μὴ πρότερον ἀνέσθαι, ἢ τῆς ὑγιείας συγγενῶν ἀπυλοῦσα, κ. τ. λ.

^k Hamon L'Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, chap. x. p. 299.

private house at Zubedi, a place in his diocese, which was vexed with evil spirits; whither one of his presbyters went to pray and offer the sacrifice of the body of Christ, at the request of the owner, that it might be delivered from them.¹ And what the historians tell us of Constantine's tabernacle,^m which he carried about with him in his camp, where all Divine offices and the holy mysteries were celebrated, may be reckoned another instance of such private consecrations.

SECT. XI. — *And commonly reserved in the Church for the same Use.*

It was also very usual for the ministers to reserve some part of the consecrated elements, either in the Church, or with them at their own house, to be in great readiness upon all such pressing occasions: as is evident from the fore-mentioned story of Serapion, in Eusebius. And Optatusⁿ intimates as much in that remarkable story which he tells of the Donatist bishops, who, in their mad zeal against the Catholics, threw the eucharist, which they found in their churches, to the dogs, but not without an immediate sign of Divine vengeance: "For the dogs, instead of devouring the elements, fell upon their masters, as if they had never known them, and tore them to pieces, as robbers and profaners of the holy body of Christ." The same is evident from the like complaint of Chrysostom concerning the tumult that happened in his church at Constantinople, when the soldiers

¹ Aug. de Civitat. Dei, lib. xxii. c. viii. p. 1485, (p. 1344, b. edit. Basil. 1569.) Vir tribunitius Hesperius apud nos est, habet in territorio Fussalensii fundum Zubedi appellatum, ubi quum adfectione animalium et servorum suorum domum suam spirituum malignorum vim noxiam perpeti comperisset, rogavit nostros, me absente, presbyteros, ut aliquis eorum illo pergeret, cujus orationibus cederent. Perrexerat unus, obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi, orans quantum potuit, ut cessaret illa vexatio: Deo protinus miserante cessavit. (vii. 503.)

^m Euseb. Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. lvi. (Cant. 658, 17.) Ἐσυντα καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τῇ τοῦ ἐκκλησίας σχήματι πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου τοῦ πολέμου παράταξιν σὺν πολλῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ κατευγάζετο· ἐν ᾗ τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ τῆς νίκης δοτῇ, τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἅμα τοῖς πιστοῦσι ποιεῖσθαι ἐκινῶν. — Sozom. lib. i. c. viii. (Cant. 19, 31.) Σκηνὴν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εὐκασμένην περιέφερεν, ἥνκα πολέμοις ἐπιστράτευιν· ὥστε μηδὲ ἐν ἐρημίᾳ διάγοντα αὐτὸν, ἢ τὴν στρατίαν, ἰεροῦ οἴκου ἀμοιρῆν, ἐν ᾗ δίδει τὸν Θεὸν ὁμνῶν, καὶ προσεύχουσαν, καὶ μυστηρίων μυστήριον.

ⁿ Optat. lib. ii. p. 55, (p. 49, edit. Paris. 1679.) Ut omnia sacrosancta supra memorati vestri episcopi violarent, jusserunt eucharistiam canibus fundi, &c.

broke into the sanctuary where the holy mysteries were reposed;° and many of them who were not initiated, saw the secrets that were concealed within; and the holy blood of Christ was spilt upon the soldiers' clothes, as is usual in such tumults and confusion. We may collect the same from what Victor Uticensis^p says of Valerian, an African bishop, that he was banished by Geisericus, king of the Vandals, because he would not deliver up the sacrament that was kept in his church. Cyril of Alexandria, in one of his epistles,^q reproves those who said the eucharist was not to be reserved to the next day. And in the Council of Constantinople, under Mennas,^r there is mention made of silver and golden doves hanging at the altar, which, most probably, were then used as the repositories of the sacrament kept in the churches. Which is also mentioned in Amphilocheius's Life of St. Basil; but no stress need be laid upon that, because it is a spurious writing; nor need we descend to the second Council of Tours,^s or other modern decrees, for the proof of that which has so good authority among the more ancient writers.

SECT. XII. — *And also for Public Use upon some Days when they made no new Consecration. This called 'Missæ Præsanctificatorum.' Its Use and Original.*

It appears also from a canon of the Council of Trullo, that the eucharist was sometimes reserved for the public use

° Chrysostom. Epist. ad Innocent. tom. iv. p. 681, B. (p. 596, fin. edit. Francof.) *Ἐνθα τὰ ἅγια ἀπίκνυντο ἐπισιλλόντες οἱ στρατιῶται, ὧν ἱνοί, καθ' ὧς ἔγνωμιν, ἀμύητοι ἦσαν, πάντα τε ἰώρων τὰ ἔνδον, καὶ τὸ ἀγιώτατον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐν τοσούτῃ θορύβῳ, εἰς τὰ τῶν προσημμένων στρατιωτῶν ἱμάτια ἔξιχυντο.*

^p Vict. de Persecut. Vandal. lib. i. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. p. 593, (tom. viii. p. 678, f. edit. Lugd. 1677.) Tunc etiam sanctus Valerianus, Abensis civitatis episcopus, dum viriliter, sacramenta Divina ne traderet, dimicasset, foras civitatem singularis jussus est pelli.

^q Cyril. Epist. ad Calofyrium in Præfat. lib. cont. Anthropomorph. tom. vi. p. 365. *Ἀκούω, ὅτι εἰς ἀγιασμὸν ἀπρακτικῶν φασὶν τὴν μυστικὴν εὐλογίαν, εἰ ἀπομῖνοι λείψανον αὐτῆς εἰς ἰδίαν ἡμέραν μαίνονται διὰ ταῦτα λίγοντες, κ. τ. λ.*

^r Conc. sub Menna, Act. v. (tom. v. Conc. p. 159, b,) *Τὰς γὰρ εἰς τύπον τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος χρυσῆς τε καὶ ἀργυρᾶς περισσὺς περιμαρῖνας ὑπερέαν τῶν Σίων πολυμνηθῶν, καὶ Δυσιασθηρίων, μιτὰ τῶν ἑλλων ἰοφτηρίζατο.*

^s Conc. Turon. II. c. iii. (tom. v. Conc. p. 853.) Ut corpus Domini in altari, non [in] imaginario ordine, sed [sub] crucis titulo, componatur.

of the Church, to be received some days after its consecration; particularly in the time of Lent, when they communicated on such elements as had been consecrated the Saturday or Sunday in the foregoing week, which were the only days in Lent on which they used the consecration-service; though they communicated, on other days, on such elements as they reserved out of the former consecration. The words of the canon are these,¹ "That on every day in the holy fast of Lent, except Saturdays and Sundays, and the feast of the Annunciation, the liturgy of the presanctified gifts shall be performed." This is best understood from another canon of the Council of Laodicea, which orders,² "That the eucharist should not be offered, in Lent, on any other day except the Sabbath and the Lord's day." Not that they prohibited the communion to be received on other days (for it was received every day), but on these days they received only that which had been consecrated before on the Sabbath and Lord's day, and what was reserved for the communion of these days, without any new consecration. This is commonly reckoned, by learned men, the beginning of this sort of communions upon reserved hosts, though it is hard to guess at the reason of the observation. Leo Allatius,³ who has written two peculiar dissertations upon this subject, tells us the reason which the Greeks themselves allege for it, is, that the consecration-service is proper only for festivals; and, therefore, all other days in Lent, besides Saturdays and Sundays, being fast-days, they did not consecrate on those days, but only communicated in the elements which had been consecrated before. This he shews at large⁴ out of Alexius Aristenus, Matthew Blastares, Balsamon, Zonaras, Michael Cerularius, and Simeon Thessalonicensis. Whether this was the true

¹ Conc. Trul. c. lii. 'Εν πάσαις τῆς ἁγίας τρισακακοστῆς τῶν νηστῶν ἡμέραις, παριστάς σαββάτου καὶ κυριακῆς καὶ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ ὑπαγγελισμοῦ ἡμέρας, γινίσθω ἡ τῶν προσηγιασμένων ἱερὰ λειτουργία.

² Conc. Laodic. c. xlix. "Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῇ τρισακακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ καὶ κυριακῇ μόνον.

³ Leo Allat. Epist. ad Naudæum de libris Eccles. Græcorum. — Id. Dissert. de Missa Præsanctificatorum, ad calcem libri de Consensu Eccles. Orient. et Occident.

⁴ Leo Allat. de Missa Præsanctific. sect. xii. tot. p. 1570-1577.

reason, or whether it be a good reason, is none of my business to inquire. I only observe, that it was an ancient practice in the Greek Church, as it continues to be at this day,^z though the Latin Church never adopted it into her service: for they used to consecrate, as well as communicate, about three in the afternoon, all the days of Lent, as is evident from Tertullian,^a St. Ambrose,^b and many others, of which there will be occasion to speak more fully, when we

^a Smith's Account of the Greek Church, p. 175. During the solemn time of Lent, set apart for the severe exercises of penance, there is no consecration of the sacrament, except on Saturdays, Sundays, and the feast of the Annunciation; for which cause, the other days are called 'Αλειτουρηητοί. But lest, by this intermission, there should seem to be a neglect of our blessed Saviour's institution, which it concerns the Christian Church to observe every day, to implore God's mercy, by the oblation and merit of this unbloody sacrifice, there is this provision made for it, yet so that the severities of the Lenten fast shall be preserved; that there shall be only celebrated in the intermediate space, τῶν προηγιασμένων λειτουργία, or 'Missa Præsanctificatorum.' Thus, at this day, according to the ancient custom, about three o'clock in the afternoon, when the fast is ended about the time of vespers (though, sometime, the old severe discipline being somewhat relaxed as to this circumstance, they do it sooner), the priest does receive and exhibit the elements, which were before consecrated; so that this solemnity is nothing but an image and repeated celebration of the former consecration, except that there are peculiar prayers allotted for this service, which are to be found in the office.

^a Tertul. de Orat. xiv. (135, B.) Similiter et stationum diebus, non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium eucharistia resolvit? an magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii, et executio officii. Si statio de militari exemplo nomen accipit, (nam et militia Dei sumus) utique nulla lætitia sive tristitia obveniens castris, stationes militum rescindit. Nam lætitia libentius, tristitia sollicitius, administrabit disciplinam.

^b Ambros. Sermon. viii. in Psalm. cxviii. p. 656, (p. 945, l. m. edit. Paris. 1642. Paris. 1836, vol. ii. p. 288.) Si te fames quotidianum cogit ad prandium, aut intemperantia declinat jejunium; tamen cœlesti magis te servato convivio. Non epulæ paratæ extorqueant, ut cœlestis sis vacuus sacramenti. Differ aliquantulum, non longe finis est diei: immo plerique sunt ejusmodi dies; ut statim meridianis horis adveniendum sit in ecclesiam, canendi hymni, celebranda oblatio. Tunc utique paratus adsiste; ut accipias tibi munimentum; ut corpus edas Domini Jesu, in quo remissio peccatorum est, postulatio divinæ reconciliationis et protectionis æternæ. . . . Admonet etiam sacrificium vespertinum, ut numquam Christum obliviscaris. Non potes oblivisci, quum lectum adscendis, ejus Domini, cui in occasu diei precem fuderis, qui esurientem te sui corporis epulis expleverit.

come to the facts and festivals of the Church. Leo Allatius thinks this *missa præsanctificatorum* is intended by Socrates, when he says,^c “On Wednesdays and Fridays, at Alexandria, they had all Divine service, except the consecration of the eucharist.” But it does not appear that they communicated at all upon those days, much less upon pre consecrated elements. However, he rightly concludes, that Durantus and others, who confound this *missa præsanctificatorum* with the *missa sicca*,^d or ‘dry mass,’ as they called it, are wholly mistaken : because ‘dry mass’ was a corruption peculiarly crept into the Latin Church, which was condemned by many of their own divines—Eckius, Estius, Laudmeter, and the Belgic bishops, as a mere novelty, a counterfeit, and a perfect piece of pageantry: whereas this *missa præsanctificatorum* was an ancient and approved usage of the Greek Church; upon the account of which, a certain portion of the consecrated elements was reserved for the public use of the Church upon those days of Lent, on which they made no new consecration.

^c Socrat. lib. v. c. xxii. ap. Allatium, Epist. ad Naudæum, sect. ii. p. 1533. Non desunt hujusce missæ vestigia apud antiquos et potissimum Socratem, lib. v. Hist. c. xxii. (p. 295, 31.) Αὐθις δὲ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, τῇ τριτῇ, καὶ τῇ λιγομένῃ Παρασκευῇ γρηφαὶ τὴν ἀναγινώσκονται, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ταύτας ἐμνηστεύουσιν πάντα τε τὰ συνάξεις γίνεται, δίχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τελετῆς.

^d Allat. de Missa Præsanct. sect. x. p. 1566. Cum hac præsanctificatorum missa, missam, cui ‘sicca’ nomen est, confundunt: multis tamen parasangis diversam esse facile quisque intelliget, qui utramque conferet. Nam missa sicca est, ut tradit Eckius (in Adnotat. ad librum oblatum Cæsari, Art. xxi.) missæ simulatio, sacerdote agente quæ sunt celebrantis, cum introitu, collecta, epistola, evangelio, et canticis, tamen, quia non vult communicare, non consecrat: ac proinde vere missa sicca est, sine corpore ac sanguine Domini. In præsanctificatis corpus Christi, antea oblatum, absumitur, quæ nonnullorum opinione verum sacrificium est, tantorum virorum ac sanctorum auctoritate patrum suffulta, ubi sicca a plerisque theologis, Estio, Eckio, Laudmetro, et episcopis Belgis, tamquam recens, et non ante tempora Guidonis Rocheriani, auctoris Manipuli Curatorum, simulata et histronica, condemnatur, conferturque cum cœnis Heliogabali, in quibus exhibebantur videnda de diversa materia, quæ ille cœnabat: suos nihilominus et ipsa habuit defensores.

SECT. XIII.—*The Eucharist sometimes reserved in private by private Men, for daily Participation.*

But besides this reservation of the elements for public use, by the ministers of the Church, there was another private reservation of them allowed sometimes to religious persons, who were permitted to carry a portion of the eucharist home with them, and participate of it every day, by themselves, in private. This custom seems to owe its original to the times of persecution, when men were willing to communicate every day, but could not have the convenience of daily assemblies. To compensate for the want of which, they took a portion of the eucharist home with them, and participated thereof every day, in private. This seems very plainly to be intimated by Tertullian, when, speaking of a woman marrying a heathen husband, he asks her,^e “Whether her husband would not know what it was that she ate before all her other meat?” And in another place, answering the objection which some made against receiving the eucharist on a fast-day, for fear of breaking their fast, he tells them (according as some copies read it);^f “They might take the body of the Lord, and reserve it; and so they might both participate of the sacrifice, and fulfil their duty of fasting.” But I lay no stress upon this, because it is a doubtful reading. The testimony of Cyprian is more full and pregnant, who tells us a most remarkable story of a woman,^g “Who having sacrificed at the heathen altars, when she came afterward to open her chest, where she kept the holy sacrament of the Lord, she was so terrified with a sudden eruption of fire, that she durst not touch it.” And the ancient author who writes against the Roman shows, under the name of Cyprian,^h brings in one going immediately from

^e Tertul. ad Uxor. lib. ii. c. v. p. 169, B. Non sciet maritus, quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes? Et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur?

^f Ibid. de Orat. c. xiv. Accepto corpore et reservato (or, re servata), utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii et executio officii.

^g Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 132, (p. 94, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Quum quædam mulier arcam suam, in qua Domini sanctum fuit, manibus indignis tentasset aperire, igne inde surgente deterrita est, ne auderet attingere.

^h Ibid. de Spectaculis, p. 3, in Append. Oculos ad idololatricæ spectaculum

church, as soon as he was dismissed, to the theatre, carrying the eucharist with him, according to custom, even among the obscene bodies of harlots. Gregory Nazianzen¹ also speaks of his sister Gorgonia having the eucharist in her chamber. And Basil says,¹ "It was customary, in times of persecution, for Christians, when they could not have a priest or a deacon present with them, to take the eucharist with their own hands. As they who led a solitary life, at a great distance from the priest, commonly took the eucharist with their own hands also." And it was customary at Alexandria, and throughout Egypt, for the people every one to take the sacrament home with them. St. Jerom also intimates the same, when he asks those who thought they might safely take the sacrament at home, when they were not prepared to do it in the church,¹ "Whether they thought there was one Christ in public, and another in private? Why were they afraid to go to church? If it was not lawful to receive it in the church, it was not lawful to receive it at home." St. Ambrose likewise, in his funeral oration upon his brother Satyrus, says of him,¹ "That he obtained the body of

per libidinem duxit: ausus secum Spiritum Sanctum in lupanarium ducere, si potuisset; qui festinans ad spectaculum, dimissus, et adhuc gerens secum, ut assolet, eucharistiam inter corpora obscena meretricum tulit.

¹ Nazian. Orat. xi. de Gorgonia, p. 187. See sect. x. of this chapter, note (!), p. 187.

¹ Basil. Ep. cclxxxix. Τὸ δὲ, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ διωγμοῦ καιροῖς, ἀναγκάζεσθαι τινα, μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως ἢ λυταυροῦ, τὴν κοινωνίαν λαμβάνειν τῇ ἰδίᾳ χερὶ, μηδαμῶς εἶναι βαρὺ, περιττόν ἐστιν ἀποδεικνύει, διὰ τὸ τὴν μακρὰν συνήθειαν τοῦτο δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων πιστώσασθαι πάντες γὰρ οἱ κατὰ τὰς ἐρήμους μονάζοντες, ἴθνα μὴ ἴσταν ἱερῆς, κοινωνίαν οἱκοι κατέχοντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν· ἐν Ἀλιξ-ανδρείᾳ δὲ καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἕκαστον καὶ τῶν ἐν λαῷ τιλούμενων, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλείστον, ἔχου κοινωνίαν ἐν τῇ οἰκῇ αὐτοῦ. . . . ταυτὸν τοῖνον ἴσθι τῇ δυνάμει, εἴτε μίαν μερίδα δέξισαί τις παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως, εἴτε πολλὰς μερίδας ἑαυτοῦ.

¹ Hieron. Epist. l. ad Pammachium. Quare ad martyres ire audent? Quare non ingrediuntur ecclesias? An alius in publico, alius in domo, Christus est? Quod in ecclesia non licet, nec domi licet.

¹ Ambros. Orat. de Obitu Fratris, tom. iii. p. 19, (tom. iv. p. 315, i. edit. Paris. 1642.) Qui priusquam profectoribus esset initiatus mysteriis, in naufragio constitutus, quum ea qua veheretur, navis scrupuloso illisa vado, et urgentibus hinc atque inde fluctibus solveretur, non mortem metuens, sed ne vacuus mysterii exiret e vita; quos initiatos esse cognoverat, ab his divinum illud fidelium sacramentum poposcit; non ut curiosos oculos inferret arcanis, sed ut fidei suæ consequeretur auxilium. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 147.)

Christ of some that had it in the ship, wherein he suffered shipwreck." It is true, indeed, this custom was discouraged in Spain, in the beginning of the fifth century, upon the account of the Priscillianists, who made use of it as a pretence to cover themselves among the Catholics, and yet never ate the eucharist at all. In opposition to whom, the Council of Saragossa,^m about the year 381, made a severe decree, that if any one was found to take the eucharist in the church, and not eat it, he should be anathematized. And this was seconded by a like decree, in the first Council of Toledo.ⁿ But as these canons were only made upon a particular occasion, and for a particular country, they did not much affect the rest of the world. Insomuch that Bona himself observes,^o out of Joannes Moschus and Anastasius Bibliothecarius, several instances of the custom continuing in the seventh and eighth centuries. And, doubtless, it was the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the adoration of the host, that perfectly abolished this custom, which was thought inconsistent with them.

SECT. XIV.—*Yet this never allowed in the Public Service.*

It must be noted under this head, that though the Church, for the reasons aforesaid, allowed the people to carry the eucharist home with them, and participate of it in private by themselves; yet she never permitted any layman to have any hand in the administration of it in her public service. As the bishops and presbyters were the only persons that were allowed to consecrate the eucharist, so it was

^m Conc. Cæsar. August. c. iii. (tom. ii. p. Conc. p. 1010.) Eucharistiæ gratiam ai quis probatur acceptam in ecclesia non sumsisse, anathema sit in perpetuum.

ⁿ Conc. Tolet. I. c. xiv. (ibid. p. 1225.) Si quis acceptam a sacerdote eucharistiam non sumserit, velut sacrilegus propellatur.

^o Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. iv. Philippicus gener Mauritiæ Imperatoris, ut Anastasius Bibliothecarius in Historia scribit, noctu ab eo accersitus, timens vitæ suæ, corpus Christi percipere quæsivit, utique domi adservatum, antequam pergeret ad Imperatorem. Seleuciæ sub Dionysio episcopo miraculum accidisse narrat Joannes Moschus in Prato Spirituali; quidam enim servus fidelis sumtam communionem in die cœnæ Domini secundum consuetudinem illius provinciae linteo mundissimo involvit, et reposuit in armario; Dominus autem ejus aperiens armarium, vidit omnes sanctas particulas culmos et spicas germinasse.

the ordinary office of deacons to minister it to the people.^p And when any laymen presumed to administer it to themselves in the church, they were corrected for it by ecclesiastical censures.^q And more especially women were debarred from this and all other offices in the public ministrations,^r except what belonged to the inferior service of the deaconesses, of which I have given a full account in another place.^s

Here I cannot omit the pertinent observation made by Morinus,^t and approved by Bona^u as a judicious and true

^p See Book ii. chap. xx. sect. vii. and viii.

^q Conc. Trul. c. lviii. (tom. vi. Conc. p. 1167.) *Μηδὲς τῶν ἐν λαϊκοῖς καταγμένων ἱαυτῶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταδίδωται παρόντος ἐπισκόπου, ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, ἢ διακόνου· ὁ δὲ τι τοιοῦτον τολμῶν, ὡς παρὰ τὰ διαταγμένα ποιῶν, ἐπὶ ἰδομάδα μίαν ἀφορίζεται, ἐνταῦθεν παιδαγωγούμενος μὴ φρονεῖν παρ' ὁ δὲ φρονεῖν.*

^r Vid. Firmil. Ep. lxxv. inter Ep. Cypriani, (p. 223, edit. Fell. Amstelod.)

Atqui illa mulier, quæ prius per præstigias et fallacias dæmonis, multa ad deceptionem fidelium moliebatur, inter cetera, quibus plurimos deceperat, etiam hoc frequenter ausa est, ut et invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se panem et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino non sine sacramento solitæ prædicationis offerret. — Conc. Paris. an. 829, lib. i. c. xlv. (tom. vii. Conc. p. 1626.) Quidam nostrorum verorum virorum relatu, quidam etiam visu didicimus, in quibusdam provinciis, contra legem divinam canonicamque institutionem, feminas sanctis altaribus se ultro ingerere, sacrataque vasa impudenter contingere, et indumenta sacerdotalia presbyteris administrare, et, quod his majus, indecentius, ineptiusque est, corpus et sanguinem Domini populis porrigere, et alia quæque, quæ ipso dictu turpia sunt, exercere. Miranda sane res est, unde is illicitus in Christiana religione irrepserit usus, ut quod viris sæcularibus illicitum est, feminæ, quarum sexui nullatenus competit, aliquando contra fas sibi licitum facere potuerint: quod quorundam episcoporum incuria et negligentia provenisse nulli dubium est. . . . Quod autem mulieres ingredi ad altare non debeant, et in Concilio Laodicensi, c. xlv. et in Decretis Gelasii Papæ, tit. xxvi. copiose invenitur. Hoc ergo tam illicitum factum, quia ex toto a religione Christiana abhorret, ne ulterius fiat, inhibendum est.

^s Book ii. chap. xxii.

^t Morin. de Pœnitent. lib. viii. c. xiv. sect. ii. Nec enim in ecclesia conservabatur corpus Christi alium in finem quàm propter infirmos, una scilicet ex pane consecrato particula. Quo circa sanis non erat, extra sacrificii actionem, communicandi locus. Consuetudo hodierna corpus Christi propter fidelium communionem reservandi recens est, a monachis Mendicantibus primum introducta, deinde ab aliis plerisque usurpata, quæ nondum tamen Romani ritus rubricas expungere potuit.

^u Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. vi. Recte observat Morinus, (lib. viii. de Pœnit. c. xiv.) servatum antiquitus in ecclesia corpus Christi propter infirmorum communionem, addens hodiernam consuetudinem plures particulas reservandi ad fideles in ipsa ecclesia etiam extra sacrificium communicandos, a Mendicantibus primum introductam, et ab aliis deinde usurpatam, ipso Romano

remark, "That the Mendicants were the first that introduced the custom of keeping the sacrament in the church for private men in health to partake of, out of the time of public service in the Church." They freely own this to be a novelty, and that against the rules of the Roman Ritual, which orders the sacrament to be kept in the church only for the sick. They say, the ancients kept it in the church only upon this account, for the sake of the sick ; and that they allowed no use of the communion to men in health out of the time of the oblation, save only when they permitted the people to carry it home with them, and participate thereof in private, which was a different thing from public communicating in the church.*

SECT. XV.—*A novel Custom noted, of reserving the Eucharist for forty Days, and Inconveniences attending it.*

Whilst we are speaking of reserving the sacrament, it may not be amiss to make a remark, by the way, upon a novel custom, which is related by some of the Roman ritualists, about the time of Charles the Great. They tell us, it was usual in those days, in the ordination of a bishop or presbyter, not only to give the new ordained person the communion at that time, but also as much of it in reserve as would serve him to partake of for forty days after. This custom is mentioned by Alcuin,† and the *Ordo Romanus*,

Rituali refragante, in quo nunc etiam decernitur propter infirmos adservari. Sanis veteri ritu nullus erat communionis usus extra sacrificii actionem, nisi quum permisit ecclesia, ut accepta mysteria domum deferrent.

‡ The reader that would see more abuses crept into the Roman service, may consult the Twenty-first Session of the Council of Basil, cap. de spectaculis in ecclesia non faciendis ; or Mr. Gregory's Dissertation, called *Episcopus Puerorum* ; where he will see how the episcopal office was used to be mimicked in pageantry on Innocent's Day in many churches.

† Alcuin. de Divinis Offic. c. xxxvii. agens de Ordinatione Episcopi in Ecclesia Romana. Pontifex ad communicandum porrigit ei formatam atque sacram oblationem, quam accipiens communicat super altare : cetera vero reservat sibi ad communicandum usque ad dies quadraginta. — Fulbert. Epist. ad Finardum, (Bibl. Patr. Max. tom. xviii. p. 6, f. edit. Lugd. 1677.) Episcopus, qui vices Christi tenet, sacerdotales viros in plebem subjectam missurus, sacri corporis eucharistiam per quadragenos dies sumendam distribuit ; et dum, verbi gratia, quotidie cœlestis panis alimonia reficiuntur, tempus illud in mente habeant,

and Fulbertus Carnotensis; and Bona^x does not pretend to find it in any more ancient writers. It is hard to guess at the reasons of this custom; and therefore I content myself barely to mention it, without further inquiry into the mystery of it. I only observe, that sometimes great inconveniences followed upon this long reservation of the sacrament: for it would often grow mouldy, corrupt, and stink; and then they were hard put to it to determine which way to dispose of it. Sometimes, by the negligence of the priest, it was devoured by mice or other animals: in which case, the priest was to do penance forty days for his neglect, as Gratian^y cites a canon out of some Council of Arles, or Orleans, to this purpose. But if it grew stale and corrupted, then it was to be burnt, by other canons cited by Ivo^z and Burchardus^a out of the Council of Arles, ordering, "That in this case it should be burnt, and the ashes of it buried under the altar." Which Algerus^b assures us was the custom in his time, as Bona^c confesses out of him. And the very canon of the mass has a rubric still in being,^d "That if a fly, or spider, or any such animal, falls into the cup after consecration, the priest, when mass is ended, must take it out and wash it with wine, and burn it in the fire." And so he must do, if it be spilt upon the ground, he must gather up the

quo per quadraginta dies Dominus discipulis apparens, et convalescens desiderata visionis satietate refecit.

^x Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. xxiii. sect. ix.

^y Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. ii. c. xciv. Qui bene non custodierit sacrificium, et mus vel aliquod aliud animal illud comederit, quadraginta diebus peniteat.

^z Ivo Decret. part. ii. c. lvi.

^a Burchard. lib. v. c. l.

^b Alger. de Eucharistia, lib. ii. c. i.

^c Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xix. sect. ii. Quod si contingeret, ut ministrorum incuria putrescerent, statuit Concilium Arelatense apud Ivonem, (part. ii. c. lvi.) ut igne comburantur, et cinis juxta altare sepeliatur; idque in usu fuisse docet Algerus, lib. ii. c. i.

^d Missal. de Defectibus Missæ, c. x. Si post consecrationem ceciderit musca aut aliquid ejusmodi, et fiat nausea sacerdoti, extrahat eam, et lavet cum vino, finitaque missa comburat, et combustio ac lotio hujusmodi in sacrarium projiciatur. Item, Si per negligentiam aliquid de sanguine Christi ceciderit, si quidem super terram seu super tabulam, lingua lambatur; et locus ipse radatur, quantum satis est, et abrasio comburatur; cinis vero in sacrarium recondatur.

earth, and burn it. And yet some of the schoolmen* cry out against this as a horrible sacrilege, to burn the consecrated host, though it be grown mouldy, which, according to their opinion, would be to burn the body of God. He that would see to what difficulties the Roman casuists are driven upon this point, to tell what becomes of the body of Christ, when the sacrament happens to be thus corrupted, and how they distress and confute another, may consult the learned Aubertin,^f who has particularly considered their several different answers, no less than seven in number; and shewed the vanity of them all, in that elaborate work of his upon the eucharist, against the doctrine of the Romish Church. I will not lead my reader too far out of his way, with long digressions about such things; but return to the business of the ancient Church.

SECT. XVI.—*The Eucharist sometimes given to Energumens, in the Intervals of their Distemper.*

Though they did not receive energumens, or persons vexed with evil spirits, promiscuously to the communion, yet neither did they wholly reject them; but, in the intervals of their distemper, if they shewed any signs of piety and sobriety, they admitted them to partake of it. This we learn from the Canons of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, who proposes this question,^g “Whether a communicant may communicate, if he be possessed?” And answers it, “If he does not expose or blaspheme the mysteries, he may communicate now and then.” And Cassian says,^h “The same resolution was given to the question by the Egyptian fathers, who did not use to interdict them the communion, but rather desired they should, if possible, communicate every

* Petrus Paludanus in Sentent. lib. iv. quæst. i. art. iii. Hostias consecratas, quamvis mucidas, comburere, immane sacrilegium.

^f Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. i. c. xix, pp. 122, 123.

^g Timoth. Respons. c. iii. ap. Bevereg. tom. ii. p. 165. 'Ερώτησις· 'Εάν πιστός τις ὃν δαιμονίζεται, ἰφίλῳ μεταλαβὼν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων, ἢ οὐ; 'Απόκρισις· 'Εάν μὴ ἔξαγορεύῃ τὸ μυστήριον, μήτε ἄλλως πως βλασφημῇ, μεταλαμβανέντω· μὴ μὲν τοι καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέρην αὐτῷ κατὰ καιροὺς μόνον.

^h Cassian. Collat. vii. c. xxx. Communionem eis sacrosanctam a senioribus nostris numquam meminimus interdictam: quinimo, si possibile esset, etiam quotidie eis impertiri eam debere censebant. . . . Hoc namque modo curatum et Andronicum nuper adpeximus, aliosque complures. (P. 330.)

day: for by this means they had relieved one Abbot Andronicus, and many others, of their distemper." So that though the canons and rules of the Church seem to drive away the energumens, together with the catechumens and penitents, they are to be understood with this exception; or, at least, we must say, the Church observed a different discipline in different places.

SECT. XVII. — *All Men debarred from it, that were guilty of any notorious Crime, of what Rank or Degree soever.*

It would be endless to enumerate here all the particular crimes for which men were debarred the holy communion; we shall have a more proper occasion to specify them (See Book xvi.), when we come to treat more perfectly and distinctly of the Church's discipline. It may be sufficient to note here, in general, that all who were guilty of any notorious crimes were rejected from participating at the holy table, whatever rank or degree they were of, even though it were the emperor himself, as appears from the case of Theodosius, whom St. Ambrose resolutely and absolutely refused, for a barbarous murder committed by his authority upon seven thousand men at Thessalonica, till he had both confessed his fault, and made ample satisfaction: as the reader may find the story, at large, excellently related by Theodoret,ⁱ in his History, and which I will relate from him (Book xvi. c. iii. sect. v.), in its proper place. Some other particular cases are proposed and answered in the Canons of Dionysius,^k and Timothy,^l and by St. Jerom,^m which, because

ⁱ Theodoret. lib. v. c. xvii. tot.

^k Dionys. c. ii. ap. Bevereg. tom. ii. p. 4. Περὶ τῶν ἐν ἀφίδρῳ γυναικῶν, εἰ προσῆκιν αὐτὰς οὕτω διακιμῖνας εἰς τὸν οἶκον εἰσίναι τοῦ Θεοῦ, περιττὸν καὶ τὸ πυνθάνεσθαι νομίζω· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὰς οἶμαι πιστὰς εἶναι καὶ εὐλαβεῖς, τολμήσειν αὐταῖς διακιμῖνας, ἢ τῇ στραπίῃ τῇ ἀγίᾳ προσελθεῖν, ἢ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου προσάψασθαι. — Id. c. iv. Οἱ δ' ἐν ἀπροαιρέτῳ νυκτερινῇ βύσει γινόμενοι καὶ οὗτοι τῇ ἰδίᾳ συνιδόσι κατακολουθεῖν, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς εἴτε διακρίνονται περὶ τούτου, εἴτε μὴ, σκοπίτωσαν, κ. τ. λ.

^l Timoth. c. v. ap. Bevereg. p. 166. Ἐὰν γυνὴ συγγίνηται μὲτὰ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς τὴν νύκτα, ἢ ἀνὴρ μὲτὰ γυναικὸς, καὶ γίνηται μίξις, ὀφείλουσι μεταλαβῆναι, ἢ οὐ; Ἀπόκρισις. Οὐκ ὀφείλουσι, τοῦ ἀποστόλου βωδόντος, Μὴ ἀποστρεφῆτε ἀλλήλους, κ. τ. λ. — Can. vi. Ἐρώτησις. Εἰ γυνὴ ἴδῃ τὸ κατ' ἑθὺς τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτῆς, ὀφείλει προσέρχεσθαι τοῖς μυστηρίοις αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἢ οὐ; Ἀπόκρισις. Οὐκ ὀφείλει, ὥς οὗ καθαρισθῇ.

^m Hieron. Epist. l. ad Pammach. c. vi. Paulus apostolus dicit, quando

they are rather private cases of conscience than matters of public discipline, I refer the reader to their proper authors for them.

SECT. XVIII. — *The Question of Digamy, or second Marriage, stated. Whether it debarred Men any Time from the Communion.*

There is one question, in a doubtful case, which the obscurity of some ancient canons has made very perplexed and intricate in the resolutions of learned men, which, therefore, may not be silently passed over; that is, the question about digamy, or second marriage: in what sense it excluded men for some time from the holy communion? The penalty inflicted upon them is, abstinence from the sacrament for one year or two; which, I freely own, as it is ordered and worded by the Canons of Neocæsarea,ⁿ Laodicea,^o and St. Basil,^p is one of the hardest cases we meet with in all the history of the ancient Church. Bishop Beveridge, and some others, think they mean only second marriages that are contracted whilst the first remains undissolved; and, if so, there would be no difficulty in the case, for a severer penance might be laid upon such as retain two wives at once. And, therefore, others think they intended

coimus cum uxoribus, nos orare non posse. Si per coitum, quod minus est impeditur, id est, orare, quanto plus quod majus est, id est, corpus Christi prohibetur accipere?

ⁿ Conc. Neocæs. c. vii. (tom. i. Conc. p. 1482.) Πρισϋτέρον εις γάμους διγαμούντων μὴ ἰστιάσθαι ἱπὶ μισάνοιαν αἰτοῦντος τοῦ διγάμου, τίς ἴσται ὁ πρισϋτέριος, ὁ δὲ διὰ τῆς ἰστιάσεως συγκατατιθέμενος τοῖς γάμοις;

^o Conc. Laodic. c. i. (tom. i. Conc. p. 1496.) Περὶ τοῦ, διὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα τοὺς ἐλευθέρως καὶ νομίμως συναφθίντας διυτέριος γάμοις, μὴ λαθρογαμίαν ποιήσαντας, ὀλίγου χρόνου παρελθόντας, καὶ σχολασάντων ταῖς προσηχαῖς καὶ νηστίαις, κατὰ συγγνώμην ἀποδίδοσθαι αὐτοῖς τὴν κοινωνίαν ὠρίσασιν.

^p Basil. c. iv. Περὶ τριγάμων καὶ πολυγάμων τὸν αὐτὸν ὠρίσασιν κανόνα, ὅτι καὶ ἱπὶ τῶν διγάμων, ἀναλόγως· ἵνα αὐτὸν μὴ γὰρ ἱπὶ διγάμων, ἄλλοι δὲ δύο ἴτη· τοὺς δὲ τριγάμους ἢ τρισὶ καὶ τισράσι πολλαῖς ἴτισιν ἀφορίζουσιν· ὀνομάζουσι δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον, οὐκ ἴτι γάμον, ἀλλὰ πολυγαμίαν· μᾶλλον δὲ πορνίαν κικλοασμένην . . . συνήθειαν δὲ κατελάττομεν, ἱπὶ τῶν τριγάμων πινεταιρίας ἀφορισμόν· οὐκ ἀπὸ κανόνων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν προειληφότων ἀκολουθίας. διὲ δὲ μὴ πάντη αὐτοὺς ἀπείργειν τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ἀλλ' ἀκροάσας αὐτοὺς ἄξιον ἢ δύο που ἴτισιν ἢ τρισὶ· καὶ μιστὰ ταῦτα ἱπὶ τρέπιν συστήκειν μὴν, τῆς δὲ κοινωνίας τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀπίχισθαι, καὶ οὕτως ἐπιδιδαμένους καρπὸν τινα μετανοίας, ἀποκαριστῆν τῇ τόπῃ τῆς κοινωνίας.

to discourage, though not absolutely to forbid, second marriages, made successively after the obligation of the first was cancelled by death; but, then, how to reconcile this with the apostolical rules, is not very easy to determine. Neither can it be excused from inclining to the errors of the Novatians and Montanists, for which Tertullian pleads so stiffly against the Church in his book *De Monogamia*, and other places. I should rather think these canons intended no more but to discountenance marrying after an unlawful divorce, which was a scandalous practice, however allowed by the laws of Jews and Gentiles; and this the rather, because Tertullian's arguments against the Catholics imply, that they allowed of second marriages successively in all except the clergy, and many Churches admitted digamists (in that sense) even into orders too, as I have shewed out of Tertullian himself, and Chrysostom, and Theodoret, more fully in another place.¹ And if these canons intended any thing more, they must be looked upon as private rules, which could not prescribe against the general sense and practice of the Catholic Church.

SECT. XIX.—*The corrupt Custom of some, who gave the Eucharist to the Dead, censured by the Ancients.*

There was one very corrupt and superstitious practice began to creep pretty early into the African Churches, and some others, which the fathers censure very heartily, as it justly deserved: that was, giving the eucharist to the dead. The third Council of Carthage has a canon to this purpose,² "That the eucharist should not be given to the bodies of the dead: for the Lord said, 'Take this, and eat;,' but dead bodies can neither take nor eat. Caution also is to be used, that the brethren may not, through ignorance, believe that dead bodies may be baptized, seeing the eucharist may not be given to them." And this, with a little variation, is

¹ Book iv. chap. v. sect. iv.

² Conc. Carth. III. c. vi. Placuit, ut corporibus defunctorum eucharistia non detur. Dictum est enim a Domino, 'Accipite et edite.' Cadavera autem nec accipere possunt nec edere. Cavendum est etiam, ne mortuos baptizari posse fratrum infirmitas credat, quibus nec eucharistiam dari licitum est.

repeated in the African Code,^a where the cause of both errors, as well in baptism as the eucharist, is ascribed to the ignorance of the presbyters misguiding the people. A like canon was made in the Council of Auxerre, in France (an. 578), a little before the time of Gregory the Great,^b which shews, that the same abuse had got some footing there also. St. Chrysostom also speaks against it,^c though he does not intimate that it was practised by any Catholics, but rather (if by any) by the Marcionite heretics, who, as they gave a vicarious baptism to the living for the dead, so, perhaps, might give the eucharist to the dead themselves: both which absurdities he refutes, at once, from the words of our Saviour. “To whom did he say, ‘Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you?’ Did he speak to the living, or to the dead? And, again, ‘Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God.’” It appears also, that, long after St. Chrysostom’s time, there were some remains of this error in the Greek Church: for the Council of Trullo repeats the prohibition in the words of the Council of Carthage,^d “Let no one impart the eucharist to the bodies of the dead, for it is written, ‘Take, and eat;’ but the bodies of the dead can neither take nor eat.”

SECT. XX.—*Parallel to which is the Abuse of burying the Eucharist with the Dead.*

Bona does not undertake to defend this abuse: but he does another, which is no less absurd, because he found it in

^a Cod. Afric. c. xviii. "Ἡρουν, ἴσα τοῖς σώμασι τῶν τελευτῶντων εὐχαριστία μὴ δοθῇ· γίγρεσθαι γὰρ, Λάβεισι, φάγεισι· τὰ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν σώματα οὐδὲ λαβεῖν δύναται, οὐδὲ φαγεῖν· καὶ ἴσα μὴ τοὺς ἥδη τελευτῶντας βαπτισθῆναι σποιήσῃ ἢ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἄγνοιαι.

^b Conc. Antissiodor. c. xii. (tom. v. Conc. p. 958.) Non licet mortuis nec eucharistiam nec osculum tradi.

^c Chrysostom. Hom. xi. in 1 Cor. p. 688, (p. 449, edit. Francof.) Τίσι δὲ ἔλιν, Ἐὰν μὴ φάγητί μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίησί μου τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχουσιν ζωὴν ἐν αἰατοῖς· τοῖς ζῶσιν, ἢ τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν, εἰπὶ μοι; καὶ πάλιν· Ἄν μὴ τις ἀκαταγρηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

^d Conc. Trul. c. cxxxiii. Μηδὲς τοῖς σώμασι τῶν τελευτῶντων τῆς εὐχαριστίας μεταδιδότω· γίγρεσθαι γὰρ, Λάβεισι, φάγεισι· τὰ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν σώματα οὐδὲ λαβεῖν δύναται, οὐδὲ φαγεῖν.

the practice of St. Benedict, and related with approbation by Gregory the Great; that is, the custom of burying the eucharist with the dead. Bona says,^x this was done by St. Basil in the Greek Church, as is reported in his Life; but all men know the author of that life to be both a spurious and a legendary writer. That which he alleges out of Gregory is more authentic: for he says,^y “St. Benedict ordered the communion to be laid upon the breast of one of his monks, and to be buried with him.” He reckons these things were done either by Divine instinct, or by compliance with received custom, which is since abrogated. But he produces no rule of his Church to shew its abrogation; and, whatever rules there may be to the contrary, it is certain the practice continued still: for not only Balsamon^z and Zonaras speak of it in their time, but Ivo says,^a “When the body of St. Othmar was translated, the sacrament was taken up out of the dormitory with him.” And a learned

^x Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. vi. Notabile est, quod in præcitata Basilii vita refertur; quum enim precibus a Deo gratiam obtinuisset, ut suis verbis sacrificium offerre posset, accepto divinitus pane et vino, ipsisque consecratis, tempore confractionis panem divisit in tres partes, et unam quidem cum multo timore et veneratione sumpsit, alteram vero una secum sepeliendam servavit, tertiam denique in columba aurea depositam desuper sacrum altare suspendit. Quod ideo hoc loco adnotandum censui, quia olim viguit hic mos consepeliendi mortuis eucharistiam, non solum apud Græcos, sed etiam apud Latinos. Exstat siquidem exemplum S.ⁱ Benedicti, qui, ut Gregorius scribit, (lib. ii. dialog. c. xxiv.) puerum monachum extra claustra defunctum sepulturæ tradi jussit, posito super pectus ejus Dominico corpore, quod ad hunc effectum ipsemet dedit, ne terra defossum cadaver projiceret, sicut antea bis acciderat. Sive autem id fecerint sancti Patres peculiari instinctu, ne umquam a Domino separarentur, sive ex consuetudine tunc recepta, hæc tamen postmodum abrogata fuit.

^y Gregor. Dialog. lib. ii. c. xxiv. Jussit communionem Dominici corporis in pectus defuncti reponi, atque sic tumulari.

^z Balsam. in c. lxxxiii. Conc. Trul. (apud Bever. tom. i. p. 253.) Τὸ μὲν τοι χειρίζεσθαι τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι μετὰ τιλιωτὴν ἄγιον ἄρτον, καὶ οὕτως ἰνταφιάζεσθαι, νομίζω γίνεσθαι εἰς ἀποτροπὴν τῶν δαιμονίων, καὶ ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ ἰφοδιάζηται πρὸς οὐρανόν, ὃ τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ καταξιώσεως παργύλλματος.—[Not. Zonaras, quem Binghamus simul adlegat, de hac consuetudine nihil hoc loco habet. —Grischov.]

^a In Vita S. Othmari, lib. ii. c. iii. ap. Surium, die xvi. Novembr. Sub capite et circa pectus viri Dei quædam panis rotulæ, quæ vulgo Oblatæ dicuntur, ita illasæ, atque ab omni corruptione extraneæ, ab eodem episcopo inveniebantur, ut in nulla omnino parte colorem vel speciem sui amittentes, adspicientium oculis infra spatium ipsius hebdomadæ viderentur esse confectæ.

man, now living, assures us,^b "That he himself, with many others, have seen the chalice, in which the sacred blood was buried, dug out of the graves of divers bishops buried in the church of Sarum." So that, whatever the laws might prohibit, the profanation continued, under pretence of piety, among the greatest men, but without any foundation, or real example, in the practice of the Primitive Church.

SECT. XXI.—*The Order of Communicating.*

We have hitherto considered what related to the communicants themselves; we are now to examine the manner of their communicating. Where, first of all, the order of their communicating occurs to our observation, which is thus described in the Constitutions:^c "First, let the bishop receive, then the presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, readers, singers, and ascetics; among the women, the deaconesses, virgins, and widows; after that, the children; then all the people in order." In Justin Martyr's time,^d when the bishop had consecrated, the deacons distributed both the bread and the cup among the communicants; but, in after ages, the bishop, or presbyter, commonly ministered the bread, and the deacons the cup after them. And there are some canons that expressly forbid^e a deacon to minister the body of Christ when a presbyter is present; and others enjoining them not to do it without necessity,^f and a license from the presbyter to do it. And it was ever accounted so great an absurdity for a presbyter to receive from the hands of a deacon, that the Council of Nice^g thought fit to make a particular canon

^b Dr. Whitby's *Idolatry of Host-Worship*, chap. i. p. 26.

^c *Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiii.* Μὲτὰ τοῦτο μεταλαμβάνειν ἡ ἐπίσκοπος, κ. τ. λ.
—See sect. vii. of this chapter, note (P), p. 172.

^d Justin. *Apol. ii. p. 97.* Εὐχαριστήσαντες δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἰκτυφημήσαντες πάντες τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι δίδουσι ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παρεῶσιν ἀποφίρουσιν.

^e Conc. Arelat. II. c. xv. Diaconi corpus Christi, præsentē presbytero, tradere non præsumant.

^f Conc. Carth. IV. c. xxxviii. Diaconus, præsentē presbytero, eucharistiam corporis Christi populo, si necessitas cogat, jussus erogat.

^g Conc. Nic. c. xviii. Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην σύνοδον, ὅτι ἦν τις τόποις καὶ πόλεσι, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οἱ διάκονοι δίδουσι ὅτι οὕτως

to forbid it. But, by permission and custom, it became their ordinary office to minister the cup,^b and sometimes both species,ⁱ to the people, observing the method prescribed to communicate every one in their proper order.

SECT. XXII.—*Some Rules observed for Distinction of Places.*

Another distinction was made in placing the communicants in their proper stations; for though no distinction was made in this case between rich and poor, they being all called alike to partake together of the same communion, as friends of one common Lord,^k yet some distinction of place, for order's sake, was generally observed, though not exactly the same in all places, but with some variety, according to the different customs of different Churches. In the Spanish Churches, it was customary for the presbyters and deacons to communicate at the altar, and the rest of the clergy in the quire, and the people without the rails of the chancel, as is plain from a canon of the fourth Council of Toledo;^l and to this a reference is made, as to an ancient custom, settled long before by former canons, in the first Council of Braga;^m which implies, that there were rules of old about this matter, since the Council of Braga could not mean the Council of Toledo, for that was after it (an. 633). The reference must be to more ancient canons, such as that of the Council of

ἡ καὶνὴν, ὅτε ἡ συνήθεια παρῖδωκε, τοὺς ἱερούς μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, τοῖς προσφίροις δίδοναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

^b Vid. Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 132, (p. 94, edit. Amstelod.) Ubi vero solemnibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cæpit, &c. — Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiii. See note (c), p. 205.

ⁱ Conc. Ancy. c. ii. (tom. i. Conc. p. 1455.) Διακόνους ὁμοίως θύσαντας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀναπαλαίσαντας, τὴν μὲν ἄλλην τιμὴν ἔχουν, πισπαύσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτου ἢ ποτῆριον ἀναφέρειν ἢ κηρύσσειν.

^k Chrysostom. Hom. x. in 1 Thess. p. 1485. (N. B. in editione Francof. quæ mihi ad manus est, non invenio, quod huc spectet.—Grisohov.)

^l Conc. Tolet. IV. c. xvii. (vol. v. p. 1711.) Sacerdos et Levita ante altare communicent, in choro clerus, extra chorum populus.

^m Conc. Bracar. I. c. xxxi. Placuit, ut intra sanctuarium altaris ingredi ad communicandum non liceat laicis viris vel mulieribus; sicut et antiquis canonibus statutum est.

Laodicea, which orders,ⁿ “That none but the clergy only should come to communicate within the chancel.” And this seems to have been the constant practice of the Greek Church, where no layman from that time, besides the emperor, was allowed to come to the altar, to make his oblations, and communicate there; but this privilege was allowed the emperor “by ancient tradition,”^o as the Council of Trullo words it. And yet even this was denied the emperor in the Italic Church: for St. Ambrose would not permit the Emperor Theodosius himself to communicate in this place, but obliged him to retire, as soon as he had made his oblations at the altar. But Valesius has observed, out of the Epistles of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria,^p “That, in the third century, it was customary both for men and women to come and stand at the altar to communicate.” And Mabillon shews,^q out of Gregory of Tours,^r that the same custom pre-

ⁿ Conc. Laodic. c. xix. Μόνους ἔξω εἶναι τοῖς ἱερᾶτικοῖς εἰσίναι εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ κοινωνεῖν.

^o Conc. Trul. c. lxix. Μὴ ἔξισται τινὶ τῶν ἀπάντων ἐν λαϊκαῖς τιλοῦντι ἔνδον ἱεροῦ εἰσίναι θυσιαστηρίου μηδαμῶς ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῆς βασιλικῆς ἐργομένης ἑξουσίας καὶ αὐθεντίας, ἥνικα ἂν βουλευθῇ προσάξει δῶρα τῇ πλάσαντι, κατὰ τινὰ ἀρχαιοτάτην παράδοσιν.

^p Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vii. c. ix. (Cant. 330.) Olim fideles ad ipsam sacram mensam accedebant, quemadmodum hoc loco [apud Eusebium] docet Dionysius, et in Epistola ad Basilidem, c. ii.; ubi de mulieribus, quæ menstruæ sanguinis fluxu laborant, ita scribit, Οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὰς ὄμαι πιστὰς οὔσας καὶ ὑλκείας, σολμήσειν οὕτως διακινύνας ἢ τῇ τραπίδι τῇ ἁγίᾳ προσελθεῖν, ἢ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσάψασθαι.—Ad quem Dionysii locum recte notat Balsamo, ‘Ὡς ἴοικε δὲ, τὸ παλαιὸν εἰσέρχοντο γυναῖκες εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας τραπίδος μισιλάμβανον: id est, ‘Olim quidem, ut apparet, mulieres ad altare accedebant, et e sacra mensa participabant.’—Postea tamen, canone xlv. Concilii Laodicensi, vetitum est, ne mulieres ad altare accederent: viris autem id ipsum interdictum est in synodo Trullana, &c.

^q Mabillon. de Liturg. Gallican. lib. i. c. v. n. xxiv. p. 51. Post benedictionem et sacerdotis communionem, fideles communicaturi ad altare accedebant, etiam mulieres, ut num. vi. notavimus: contra quam apud Hispanos, apud quos sanctorum est (Concilii quarti Toletani, c. xvii.) Ut sacerdos et Levitæ ante altare communicent, in choro clerus, extra chororum populus.—Idem fere statutum Concilii Laodicensi, c. xix. Contrarius mos apud Gallos.—In secundo Concilio Turonensi, canon quartus vetat laicos choro misceri psallentium clericorum: ad orandum vero et communicandum laicis et feminis, sicut mos est, pateant sancta sanctorum.—De Gunthramno rege id testatur Gregorius, in lib. ix. c. iii. Interea, &c. See following note.

^r Gregor. Turon. lib. ix. c. iii. Interea advenit festivitas sancti Marcelli, quæ

vailed in the Gallican Churches. And it is very evident from the second Council of Tours, which has a canon to this purpose, "That though laymen, at other times, should not come into the chorus, or chancel, yet, when the oblation was offered,* both men and women might come into the Holy of Holies to communicate at the altar;" so that this was plainly one of those rites which varied according to the difference of times and places, and the various usages and customs of different Churches. There are a great many other customs, relating to the manner of communicating, which are of greater moment, and become matters of great dispute in these latter ages; and, therefore, it will be necessary to consider and examine them a little more particularly; which I shall do in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V.

A RESOLUTION OF SEVERAL QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE MANNER OF COMMUNICATING IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

SECT. I.—*That the People were always admitted to receive in both Kinds.*

THE first and most momentous question of this kind is, Whether the people, and such of the clergy as did not consecrate, were generally admitted to communicate in both kinds?—The principal advocates of popery, at the beginning of the Reformation,* were not willing to own, that the

apud urbem Cabilonensem mense septimo celebratur: et Guntchramnus rex adfuit. Verum ubi, peractis solemnibus, ad sacrosanctum altarium communicandi gratia accessisset, venit quidam, quasi aliquid suggesturus. — Id. lib. x. c. viii. Episcopus permisit eum cum ceteris missarum spectare solemnia. Verum ubi ad communicandum ventum est, et Eulalius ad altare accessisset, ait episcopus, 'Rumor populi parricidam te proclamat esse,' &c.

* Conc. Turon. II. c. iv. Ut laici secus altare, quo sancta mysteria celebrantur, inter clericos, tam ad vigiliis, quam ad missas, stare penitus non præsument: sed pars illa, quæ a cancellis versus altare dividitur, choris tantum psallentium pateat clericorum. Ad orandum vero et communicandum, laicis et feminis, sicut mos est, pateant sancta sanctorum.

* Eckii Enchirid. c. x. de Eucharistia, p. 130. Fatemur, hunc usum fuisse in

universal practice of the Primitive Church was against the modern sacrilege of denying the cup to the people; and, therefore, though they confessed there were some instances in antiquity of communion under both kinds, yet they maintained the custom was not universal. So Eckius, and Harding, and many others. But they, who have since considered the practice of the ancient Church more narrowly, are ashamed of this pretence; and freely confess, that, for twelve centuries, there is no instance of the people's being obliged to communicate only in one kind, in the public administration of the sacrament; but, in private, they think some few instances may be given. This is Cardinal Bona's distinction, whose words are so remarkable, that I cannot forbear to transcribe them: "It is very certain," says he,^b "that anciently, all in general, both clergy and laity, men and women, received the holy mysteries in both kinds, when they were present at the solemn celebration of them, and they both offered and were partakers; but, out of the time of sacrifice, and out of the church, it was customary, always and in all places, to communicate only in one kind. In the first part of the assertion all agree, as well Catholics as sectaries; nor can any one deny it that has the least knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs. For the faithful, always and in all places, from the very first foundation of the Church to

primitiva ecclesia: nec tamen universalis fuit usus. — Id. Hom. xxxiii. Non negamus, immo libere profitemur, in quibusdam particularibus ecclesiis, in principio atque deinde aliquanto post, sacramentum hoc etiam laicis in utraque specie esse porrectum. — Harding's Answer to Jewel's Challenge, art. ii. p. 30. — Bellarmin. de Euchar. iv. c. xxiv.

^b Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xviii. sect. i. Certum est, omnes passim clericos et laicos, viros et mulieres, sub utraque specie sacra mysteria antiquitus sumsisse, quum solemnium eorum celebrationi aderant, et offerebant, et de oblatis participabant. Extra sacrificium vero, et extra ecclesiam semper et ubique communio sub una specie in usu fuit. Primæ parti adsertionis consentiunt omnes, tam Catholici quam sectarii; nec eam negare potest, qui vel levissima rerum ecclesiasticarum noticia imbutus sit. Semper enim et ubique ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles: cæpitque paulatim ejus sæculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo interdicentibus ob periculum irreverentiæ et effusionis, quod inevitabile erat, aucta fidelium multitudine, in qua deesse non poterant minus cauti et attentius ac parum religiosi. . . . Hæc mutatio facta est primum a diversis episcopis in suis ecclesiis, deinde a synodo Constantiensi canonica sanctione pro omnibus stabilita, &c.

the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the species of bread and wine; and, in the beginning of that age, the use of the cup began, by little and little, to be laid aside, whilst many bishops interdicted the people the use of the cup, for fear of irreverence and effusion. And what they did first for their own churches, was afterward confirmed by a canonical sanction in the Council of Constance." This is as fair and ample a confession for the practice of the universal Church as we desire, and it serves to shew the vanity of all those arguments, from Scripture and antiquity, that were offered at by the first managers of this dispute, to prove the practice of communicating in both kinds not to be universal. It supersedes, also, all further trouble of citing authorities in this dispute, as unnecessary in a matter so much beyond all doubt and exception, by the adversaries' own confession. Though the reader that desires to see the authorities produced at large, may find them in Vossius,^c and Du Moulin,^d and more amply in Chamier,^e and a late treatise of a learned writer^f in our own tongue, shewing, that there is no Catholic tradition for communion in one kind. But Bona not only grants us all this, but tacitly answers all the plausible arguments used by Bellarmin,^g and others, to persuade their readers into a belief of the ancient Church giving the communion only in one kind. Bellarmin urges the frequent mention of reducing delinquent clergymen to lay-communion; which he interprets communion in one kind. But Bona rejects this notion of lay-communion as utterly false,^h reflecting tacitly upon

^c Voss. Thes. Theol. Disput. v. de Symbolis Cœnæ Domin.

^d Moulin's Novelty of Popery, book vii. controversy xii.

^e Chamier. de Eucharist. lib. viii. c. ix.

^f Demonstration that the Church of Rome has erred in her Decrees about Communion in one kind.

^g Bellarmin. de Eucharist. lib. iv. c. xxiv. Quintus ritus erat, usus communionis laicæ, quæ in pœnam gravis alicujus delicti olim dabatur clericis, ablata eis communione clericali. Est autem hujus communionis crebra mentio in decretis antiquissimorum pontificum et conciliorum, &c.

^h Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xix. sect. iii. Recentiores, qui audito nomine communionis, ejus veteri notione neglecta, id solum concipiunt, quod hodie ea voce significatur, laicam communionem nihil aliud esse putant, quam perceptionem eucharistiæ sub unica specie, aut extra cancellos, more laicorum; quod

Bellarmin, and other modern writers of his own Church, as ignorant of the ancient discipline, who no sooner hear of the name 'lay-communion,' but, presently, they take it in the sense that it now bears, and interpret it 'communion in one kind;' "Which, how false it is," says he, "we may learn from hence, that we often read of clergymen being thrust down to lay-communion at that time, when laymen communicated in both kinds." Others draw an argument from that which the ancients call *communio peregrina*, 'the communion of strangers,' which they interpret communion in one kind. But Bona¹ takes a great deal of pains to shew the ignorance of these men, and makes an accurate inquiry into the true notion of this sort of communion; concluding that, whatever it meant, it did not mean communion in one kind. Bellarmin draws another argument or two from the reservation of the eucharist, for the use of the sick, and from that private and domestic communion, which we have seen before was allowed to private Christians in their own houses, or in a journey, or in the wilderness: all which Bellarmin will have to have been only in one kind. But, besides that this is false in itself (for they reserved not only one, but both kinds for these uses, as we shall see more by and by), Bona says,¹ "It is altogether beside the question; for the question is not about private and extraordinary communion in cases of great exigency, but about the public, solemn, and ordinary communion of the Church:" concerning which, he concludes, no instance can be produced, before the twelfth century, of its being celebrated only in one kind.

But then, that he may not seem to give up the cause of his Church, and desert it as wholly desperate, he pretends that the change that was made by the Council of Constance,

quam falsum sit, vel ex eo liquet, quod sæpe clericos ad laicam communionem detrusos legimus, eo tempore, quo etiam laici sub utraque specie communicabant.

¹ Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xix. sect. v. Quidam inter quos est Binius in notis ad Concilium Ilerdense, communionem peregrinam cum laica confundunt: sed non est credibile, veterem ecclesiam eandem rem diversis adeo vocabulis expressisse. . . . Alii existimarunt, nihil aliud esse, quam perceptionem eucharistiæ sub una tantum specie. Verum quid magis alienum a disciplina veterum patrum, &c.

¹ Ibid. c. xviii. sect. i. See above, note (b), p. 209.

and confirmed by the Council of Trent,^k was against no Divine law; for communion in both kinds was neither instituted by God, nor did the ancient fathers ever teach it to be necessary to salvation. One would wonder to see discerning men so infatuated. What words can be able to express a Divine institution, if those of our Saviour are not, "Drink ye *all* of this?" Or how should the fathers believe communion in both kinds not to be necessary, who thought it necessary for children; and actually communicated them in both kinds, whenever they were capable of receiving it, as we have seen before? But he was sensible some of their own popes have called it a grand sacrilege to divide the mystery. Gelasius complains,^l "That some received the bread, but abstained from the cup;" whom he condemns as guilty of superstition, and orders, "That they should either receive in both kinds, or else be excluded from both: because one and the same mystery cannot be divided without grand sacrilege." Leo the Great declaims against them after the same manner:^m "They receive the body of Christ with an unworthy mouth, but refuse to drink the blood of our redemption. Such men's sacrilegious dissimulation being discovered, let them be marked, and, by the authority of the priesthood, cast out of the society of the faithful." It is in vain to say here, as Bona does, that these decrees were only made against the Manichees, who believed wine to be

^k Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xviii. sect. i. Hæc mutatio facta est primum a diversis episcopis in suis ecclesiis, deinde a synodo Constantiensi canonica sanctione pro omnibus stabilita, nullo profecto spiritualis refectionis detrimento, ut fideles experiuntur; nulla Divinæ legis transgressione: quia communicio sub utraque specie nec divinitus instituta fuit; nec umquam antiqui patres eam ad salutem necessariam esse docuerunt.

^l Gelas. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. ii. c. xii. Comperimus, quod quidam, sancta tantummodo corporis sacri portione contenti, a calice sacri crucioris abstineant. Qui procul dubio, quia nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi, aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut integris arceantur: quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.

^m Leo, Sermon. iv. de Quadragesima, (Bibl. Patr. Max. tom. vii. p. 1015, d. edit. Lugd. 1677.) Ore indigno, Christi corpus accipiunt; sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ hac vice omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut nobis hujusmodi homines et in his manifestentur indiciois; et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur.

the gall of the prince of darkness, and the creature of the devil; and therefore refused to drink it: for their reasons are general against all superstition whatsoever, and, in their opinion, the sacrament may not be divided without grand sacrilege, and thwarting the rule of the first institution. Which Bona might also have learned from another decree related in their canon law, under the name of Pope Julius, who says,ⁿ “The giving of the bread and the cup, each distinctly by themselves, is a Divine order and apostolical institution; and that it is as much against the law of Christ to give them jointly, by dipping the one into the other, as it is to offer milk instead of wine, or the juice of the grape immediately pressed out of the cluster: all which are equally contrary to the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, as well as the custom of the Church, as may be proved from the fountain of truth, by whom the mysteries of the sacraments were ordained.” Does not this plainly imply, that communicating in both kinds, distinctly, was according to the laws of Christ, and agreeable to his rule and doctrine, as well as his example? With what face then could Bona say, “That communion in both kinds was neither instituted by God, nor did the ancient fathers judge it necessary?” when even some of their ancient popes have told us so plainly, that communion, distinctly administered in both kinds, is a Divine order, and that it is grand sacrilege to divide them. And the ancients always administered in both kinds upon this principle, because it was the law of Christ, whatever Bona or his partisans can say to the contrary.

As to the other part of the question,—whether the ancients did not, in some private or extraordinary cases, administer the sacrament in one kind, we have no dispute with Bona, as being nothing to the dispute of public communion, by his own confession; though all the arguments

ⁿ Jul. Epist. ad Episcop. Ægypt. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. ii. c. vii. Audivimus, quosdam schismatica ambitione detentos, contra divinos ordines, et apostolicas institutiones, lac pro vino in divinis sacrificiis dedicare; alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere. . . . Quod quam sit evangelicæ et apostolicæ doctrinæ contrarium, et consuetudini ecclesiasticæ adversum, non difficile ab ipso fonte veritatis probabitur, a quo ordinata ipsa sacramentorum mysteria processerunt.

made use of by him and Bellarmin in this case, are far from being exactly true and conclusive. For whereas they argue for communion in one kind from private and domestic communion, it appears from several instances, that this sort of communicating was often in both kinds. Thus Nazianzen says of his sister Gorgonia,^o "That she laid up the antitypes both of the body and blood of our Lord." And St. Ambrose, speaking of his brother Satyrus^p and others at sea, expresses the matter in such terms, as plainly imply that they both ate the bread and drunk the wine. And, whereas, again they say, the communion, reserved in the church for the use of the sick, was only in one kind; the contrary is evidently proved from Justin Martyr, who says,^q "The deacons were used to carry both the bread and wine to the absent;" and from St. Chrysostom's complaint to Pope Innocent,^r "That in that horrible assault that was made upon his church, the holy blood of Christ was spilt upon the soldiers' clothes." Which Baronius himself^s brings as an argument to prove that they were used to reserve the sacrament, in both kinds, in the church, for the use of the sick. They argue, further, from the example of such as took long journeys, or went to

^o Nazianz. Orat. xi. de Gorgon. p. 187. *Εἰ σου τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος, ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἢ χυλὸς ἰθυσάμενισιν.*

^p Ambros. Orat. de Obitu Fratris, (tom. iii. p. 19, edit. Basil. 1555.) *Quantum arbitrabatur si ore sumeret (panem puta) et toto pectoris hauriret arcano: (nempe, vinum).* (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 148.)—Voss. Thes. p. 517, (p. 329, edit. Hag.) ex Tappero. Ruardus Tapperus de exemplo Satyri, fratris Ambrosii, tractans, sic inter alia scribit, 'Videtur ex eo et simul sermone v. de Lapsis apud Cyprianum, quod illis temporibus sanguinem Domini ex calice omnes bibebant, et quod corpus Domini iis in manus dabatur, ut vel statim sumerent, vel secum portarent domum, ibique sumerent, ita ut per intervalla temporum biberent ex calice Domini, et corpus Domini manducarent.

^q Justin. Apol. ii. p. 97. See above, chap. iv. sect. xxi. note (d). Thus, also, some think that we may take St. Jerom, speaking of Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse: 'Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini canistro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro,' meaning his carrying both kinds to the sick.

^r Chrysostom. Epist. ad Innocent. tom. iv. p. 681. See above, chap. iv. sect. xi. note (c).

^s Baron. an. 404, tom. v. p. 194, edit. Morel. *Considera hæc, lector, quam procul abhorreant a patrum traditione usuque ecclesiæ Catholicæ, qui nostro tempore negant adservandam esse sacratissimam eucharistiam, quam videmus, non sub specie panis tantum, sed etiam sub specie vini, olim consuevisse recondi.*

sea, that they always communicated in one kind. But Baronius proves,^t in the same place, from the authority of Gregory the Great, that they who went to sea, carried both the body and blood of Christ along with them in the ship. And Bona himself tells us,^u there are some instances of the communion being carried in both kinds to hermits and recluses in the wilderness; as he gives an example in *Maria Ægyptiaca*, out of Sophronius. They urge, likewise, the use of the presanctified sacrament, which the Greeks used all Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, as has been noted before; and the Latins, on the *Parasceue*, or 'Good-Friday;' and this they pretend to tell us, with great confidence, was only communion in one kind: for they reserved only the bread, and not the wine, for this sort of communion. Bellarmine refers us to abundance of authors for this, as Pope Innocent (Ep. i. c. iv.), who has not a word about it; and Gregory's *Sacramentarium*, and the *Ordo Romanus in Officio Parasceues*, and Rabanus Maurus, and Micrologus. But Cassander^v has unluckily spoiled this argument, and inverted

^t Baron. an. 404, ex Gregor. dialog. iii. c. xxxvi. Habes id quoque probatum auctoritate S. Gregorii, Romani pontificis, dum ait in navi portasse navigantes Christi corpus et sanguinem.

^u Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xviii. n. ii. ex Vita Mariæ Ægyptiacæ. Non nego, aliquando simul cum corpore Christi sanguinem quoque extra ecclesiam delatum, in vita enim S. Mariæ Ægyptiacæ, a Sophronio conscripta, legimus, quod, quum in vasta eremo annis 47. vitam rigidissimam egisset, ab abbate Zozimo Dei nutu reperta, sibi que mortem imminere cognoscens, rogavit illum, ut reversus in monasterium, divini corporis et vivifici sanguinis portionem in vaso sacro sibi adferret, quia numquam communicaverat, ex quo desertum ingressa fuerat. Ille vero statuto tempore mittens in modico calice intemerati corporis et pretiosi sanguinis portionem ad eam attulit, quæ susceptis sacris mysteriis in pace quievit.

^v Cassand. de Commun. sub utraque specie, p. 1027. Graviore auctores, qui ante aliquot sæcula de ecclesiasticis officiis scripserunt, Ordinis Romani auctoritatem ad comprobendam plenam populi communionem ex hoc ipso ritu adducunt. In quo ordine jubetur, ut in Parasceue vinum non consecratum cum Dominica Oratione et Dominici corporis immissione consecratur: ut populus plene possit communicare sive (ut alius quidam in Ordinario Romano legi adfirmat) ut contractu Dominici corporis integra fiat communio. Idem censendum de liturgia *πρεσβυτερικῶν*, id est, presanctificatorum, sive imperfecta, quæ apud Græcos per quadagesimam celebrabatur quinque illis diebus hebdomadæ (qui sunt præter Sabbatum et Dominicum) quibus oblatio et consecratio non fiebat, sed sola ex presanctificatis distributio. Nam et illic vinum et aqua in calicem mittitur, et in precibus ante communionem corpus et sanguis Domini commemoratur.

it upon them. For he has observed, and Vossius after him,^w “That the *Ordo Romanus*, in the office of Good-Friday, appoints wine to be consecrated with the Lord’s Prayer, by putting some of the preconsecrated body into it, *ut populus plene possit communicare*, ‘that the people may have the full communion in both kinds.’” And the same is to be said of the Greeks’ presanctified communion: for, in that liturgy, wine and water is ordered to be put into the cup; and then, in their prayers before the communion, the elements are called, ‘the body and blood of the Lord.’ So Cassander. But Leo Allatius,^x who wrote a peculiar dissertation upon this subject, has more effectually ruined this argument, which it is a wonder Bona should not observe, who so often refers to his Dissertation, and commends it. For he shews, out of the Greek writers, Nicolas Cabasilas,^y and Simeon Thessalonicensis,^z “That, in this communion, there were both the elements of bread and wine, either consecrated before, or by the touch of one another.” So that this argument not only proves nothing to their purpose, but ruins the hypothesis of the objectors. For this presanctified commu-

^w Voss. Thes. Theol. p. 519, (p. 331, edit. Hag. Com.)

^x Allat. de Missa Præsanctificatorum, sect. vii. p. 1559.

^y Cabasil. Exposit. Missæ, c. xxiv. ap. Allat. ibid. Εἰ δὲ τινες τῶν προσεπι-
τότων εἰσόντων μετὰ τῶν δώρων τῇ ἱερῇ εἰς σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ αἷμα τὰ κομιζόμενα
δῶρα προσκυνοῦσι, καὶ διαλύονται, ἀπὸ τῆς εἰσόδου τῶν προσηγιασμένων δώρων ἡπα-
τήθησαν, ἀγνοήσαντες τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς ἱερωργίας ταύτης, ἀκρίβης· αὐτὴ μὲν γὰρ
ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ εἰσόδῃ ἄδουσα ἔχου τὰ δῶρα, καὶ οὕτω τιτιλισμένα, ἐκείνη δὲ τίλια
καὶ ἡγιασμένα, καὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ.

^z Simeon. Opusc. cont. Hæres. Καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ γίνεσθαι συνθήκη ἀκολουθία τῶν
προσηγιασμένων, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν ἁγίων εἰσόδῃ δι’ ἡμᾶς μᾶλλον ὑποσπίστανται, ὥς
τιτιλισμένων ὄντων τῶν θείων δώρων, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὄντος·
αὐτὸ γὰρ ἴσθι, τὸ κατιχόμενον ἐν τῇ δίσκῳ, τὸ πανάγιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα μετὰ τοῦ
δυοτάτου αἵματος. — Id. Respons. ad Gabriel. Pentapolitan. Καὶ περὶ μὲν τὴν
ἐννάτην ὥραν ταύτην τιλοῦμεν τὴν τιλιστὴν, ἀπασφύζοντες τὸν ἔρην τῆς νηστείας,
ἀπαξ πρὸς ἰστίαν ἰσθόντες· ἡγιαζόμεθα δὲ ταῖς εὐχαῖς, καὶ τῇ ὀψι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν,
αἷμα τῷ νοῦ αὐτὸν ὁρῶντες τὸν Κύριον, κατιχόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν, καὶ εἰς ἱλασμόν
προσιθίμενον, καὶ μεταδιδόμενον τοῖς ἀξίοις τῆς αὐτοῦ κοινωνίας· ὅτι καὶ προσπίπτειν
αὐτῷ θιερῶς ὀφείλομεν ἐκ’ ἰδάφους, καὶ συγχύρειν ἐξαιτίσθαι τῶν ἰσφαλμένων,
καὶ πάντων μμνησθαι πιστῶν, δηλονότι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς εἰσόδου, ἥνικα ἐπὶ
κεφαλῇ αὐτὸν κατιχῇ ὁ ἱερεὺς· καὶ γὰρ τιτιλισμένα εἰσὶ τὰ μυστήρια, καὶ αὐτὸ
τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ· καὶ εἰ πρὸ τοῦ τιλισθῆναι ἄξια τιμᾶσθαι τὰ δῶρα, ὥς
ἀντίτυπα, καὶ ἀφιερωμένα Θεῷ, πολλῶν μᾶλλον τιτιλισμένα ὄντα τῇ θείᾳ χερεί
διὰ τῆς ἱερωργίας, καὶ σῶμα ἀληθές, καὶ αἷμα τιλοῦνται Χριστοῦ.

nion of the Greeks was in both kinds. And the very prayers in this liturgy, both before and after the communion (as Allatius^a there observes) evidently shew it. For the priest thus prays before communion: "Vouchsafe, by thy mighty power, to impart to us thy immaculate body, and thy precious blood; and, by our ministry, to all the people." And, after communion,^b "We give thee thanks, O Lord, the Saviour of all, for all the good things thou hast given us, and for the participation of the holy body and blood of thy Christ." And Allatius observes further:^c "That the same sort of communion, in both kinds, was used on Good-Friday, in Spain, by the order of the Mozarabic Liturgy;" which agrees with what Cassander observed before out of the Latin Church. And that which led Bellarmin and Bona into the mistake, to take this for communion in one kind, was, that both the Greek and Latin Church reserved only the bread, and not the wine for this service; but when they came to communicate, they put the pre consecrated bread into a cup of wine, and said the Lord's Prayer, and some other prayers, and that was esteemed a consecration of it; and so they proceeded to communicate in both. I have been a little more particular in explaining this rite, because it is the only instance our adversaries can urge with any colour, of public communion in one kind; which yet, when rightly understood, we see, is no argument for them, but directly against them. And, at this day, the Greeks, and Maronites, and Abyssins, and all the Orientals, never communicate but in both kinds; as Bona^d himself confesses out of Abraham Ecchellensis, and

^a Allat. de Missa Præsanctificationum, sect. xix. Καὶ καταξίωσον τῇ κραταίῃ σου χερὶ μεταδόναι ἡμῖν τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος σου, καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος, καὶ δι' ἡμῶν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ.

^b Ibid. Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι τῷ Σωτῆρι τῶν ὅλων Θεῷ ἱπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς παρέχῃς ἡμῖν ἀγαθούς, καὶ ἱπὶ τῇ μεταλήψει τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου.

^c Ibid. sect. xviii. ex Missa Mozarab. in Die Parasceues. Et deinde accipiat patinam, et mundet eam super calicem cum pollice; et mundatam ponat eam sub mento, et postea sumat vinum de calice cum sua particula; quæ, secundum quosdam, consecrat vinum in calice.

^d Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xviii. sect. ii. Quod vero subjungit, duobus hisce casibus exceptis, ceteros omnes cujusvis ætatis et conditionis sub utraque specie communicare, id sacerdotes Maronitæ in urbe degentes, a me consulti, de his

other writers. And as to the other instances of the sick or infants, or men in a journey, who communicate only in one kind (if they were never so true, as we see many of them are false), they are private and extraordinary cases, that relate not to the public communion of the Church, and so come not within the state of the present question; which is only about public communion, and not what was done in some very particular and extraordinary cases.

SECT. II.—*That in receiving in both Kinds, they always received the Elements distinctly, and not the one dipped in the other.*

Having thus despatched this grand question about communion in one kind, and shewed the practice of the Church to be constantly to receive in both elements, we are next to inquire, Whether they received them both separately and distinctly, or the one dipped into, and mixed with, the other. The modern Greeks have a custom, which they have retained for some ages, of dipping the bread into the wine, and ministering it so mixed, in a spoon, to the people.* Some

intelligendum testantur, qui intra ecclesiam communicant. Liber enim Constitutionum Ecclesiæ Orientalis, quem citat Abraham Ecchellens. Epist. ad Nihusium, post quam decrevit, c. iii. sect. iii. non licere sacerdoti portare corpus sine sanguine, statim subdit, 'Exceptis ægrotis, et qui longe distant ab ecclesia, et qui impediuntibus sunt distracti negotiis, ut sunt pastores et agricolæ, qui incolunt villas, nec habent ecclesias, nec ecclesiam remotam adire possunt: similiter quoque mulieres, præsertim quum timetur, ne hinc accidat eis ignominia aliqua propter itineris distantiam: deferre autem ad hos calicem, periculosum est valde, ideoque corpus sine sanguine detur illis.' Simili modo apud Abassinos viaticum moribundis præberi sub unica specie panis Lucas Holstenius ad Nihusium scribit ex certa et fida sacerdotis Abassini relatione: idque mihi sciscitanti duo ejus nationis monachi, viri graves et senio venerabiles, quos per interpretem alloquutus sum, confirmarunt.

* Dr. Smith's Account of the Greek Church, p. 142. After they, within the sanctuary or holy place, have been partakers of the divine and tremendous mysteries, the deacon, standing at the middle door, with the chalice lifted up in his hands, invites the communicants to approach: *Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ καὶ ἀγάπης προσέλθτε.* He then dips 'a spoon' (*λαβίς*) into the chalice; and taking out a bit or bits, which are usually very small, of the consecrated bread (called *μαργαρίτας*, or 'pearls'), soaked in and floating upon the wine, he puts it to their mouths, saying to each, *Μεταλαμβάνετε τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἅγιον σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς ἄφθισιν τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.*

learned men, among whom are Latinus Latinus,^f and Arcadius,^g make this custom as ancient as the time of Pope Innocent and St. Chrysostom: but Habertus^h and Bonaⁱ

^f Latinus Epist. ad Anton. Aug. ap. Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xxiii. sect. viii. See following note (1).

^g Arcad. de Concord. lib. iii. c. liii. ap. Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xviii. sect. iii. See following note (1).

^h Habert. Archierat. part. x. observat. x. p. 271. Quintum observatione dignum est, eucharistiam aliquando sub panis specie seorsim porrectam fuisse, contra quam fit hodie apud Græcos, qui laicis micellam sancti panis, calici injectam et intinctam, cum cochleari (λαεῖδι, vocant) porrigunt. . . . Postea et nunc, ut jam dixi, communicant laici, porrecto eis corpore simul et sanguine ex cochleari.

ⁱ Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. i. c. xxiii. n. viii. Cur fermenti nomen ipsi sacramento tributum sit expendens Latinus duas causas comminiscitur, quæ pace tanti viri mihi prorsus absurdæ, et a moribus illorum temporum ex toto alienæ visæ sunt. 'Appellabatur autem fermentum, inquit, non quia aliquid haberet commune cum fermento, quo utimur ad panem fermentandum, sed ea fortasse ratione, vel quia velut massa et conspersio esset utriusque partis sacramenti, corporis videlicet et sanguinis, ita mixta, ut nullo modo separari posset. Vel quia eadem ipsa massa proprie fermenti vicem obtineret in alia majori massa fermentanda, quæ satis esse posset ad populum cujusque tituli communicandum.' Hanc vero mixtionem eo consilio factam arbitratur, ut Manichæi, qui a vino abhorrebant, detegerentur: nam mittens Pontifex illud fermentum presbyteris præcipiebat, si Latinio credimus, 'ut per eosdem presbyteros plebi universæ adstanti diligentissime declararetur fermentum illud a summo Pontifice confectum et consecratum cum admixtione utriusque speciei, eo consilio fuisse, ut qui cum ecclesia Catholica sentirent, et in ejus communione manere vellent, dum illud sumerent, profiterentur, se sub specie panis et vini simul mixta eucharistiam accipere, et tam panis quam vini creatorem Deum agnoscere, et non principem tenebrarum, ut de vino in creatoris omnium injuriam Manichæi blasphemi asserebant.' At missum ex hoc motivo fermentum, nec ex actis Melchiadis et Siricii, nec ex epistola Innocentii ulla ratione colligi potest. Nulla item assertæ mixtionis utriusque speciei apparet necessitas ad detegendos Manichæos; quum enim tunc sub utraque specie fideles communicarent, multo facilius deprehendi poterant, si a sanguinis poculo, per diaconum porrecto, abstinerent; quo indicio sub Leone Magno eos proditos ex ejus Sermone iv. de Quadrages. constat. Nihil etiam legimus in scriptoribus illorum temporum, quo Latini conjectura inniti queat. Deinde mixtio corporis et sanguinis tunc inaudita fuit, et a moribus ac ritibus ecclesiæ omnino per illa tempora dissidebat, ut lib. ii. palam fiet, quum de communione intincta disseremus. — Id. lib. ii. c. xviii. sect. iii. Suspicitur Arcudius (lib. iii. c. liii.), hanc communionem (recentiorum Græcorum) originem traxisse ex facto mulieris Macedonianæ supra commemoratæ, quæ celebrante Chrysostomo se Catholicam simulans de manu ejus eucharistiam suscepit, quam ancillæ occulte dedit, et alium panem ab eadem acceptum ori imposuit, qui in lapidem versus est. Sed nusquam lego hoc factum occasionem dedisse veterem ritum immutandi, et ex scriptis Chrysostomi constat diaconum sanguinem dis-

prove there could be no such custom in those days, it being altogether contrary to the usage of the Church, in that age, to mingle the elements together, or minister them any otherwise than separate to the people. And, indeed, there is nothing more evident than this in all the writings of the ancients, who speak of delivering the bread, first, with a certain form of words; and, after that, the cup, with another form (as we shall see more by and by); and that, commonly, by distinct persons, a bishop or a presbyter ministering the one, and a deacon the other. So that it is needless to multiply testimonies to shew, that mixing of the elements is a novel invention. I only note one passage of an epistle that goes under the name of Pope Julius, in Gratian's Collection, which seems to hint at the beginning of the practice, and condemns it as a great corruption, contrary to the primitive institution of our Saviour. "Whereas," says he,^j "some give the people the eucharist dipped in the cup, for a complement of the communion, this has no authority to be produced for it out of the Gospel, where Christ commended his body and blood to his disciples. For the Gospel speaks of the bread being apart, and the cup apart, by themselves." This is repeated, in the same words, in the third Council of Braga (an. 675).^k Bona tells us, further, out of Micrologus,^l that it was forbidden by the old Roman *Ordo*;

tribuisse : quo munere fungi desiit, quum panis, sacer sanguine tinctus, cochleari præberi cœpit.

^j Gratian. de Consecrat. Distinct. ii. c. vi. Audivimus quosdam, schismatica ambitione detentos, contra divinos ordines et apostolicas institutiones, intinctam eucharistiam populis, pro complemento communionis, porrigere : quod quam sit evangelicæ et apostolicæ doctrinæ contrarium, et consuetudini ecclesiasticæ adversum, non difficile ab ipso fonte veritatis probabitur, a quo ordinata ipsa sacramentorum mysteria processerunt. . . . Quod, pro complemento communionis, intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium recepit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit. Seorsum enim panis, et seorsum calicis, commendatio memoratur. Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum præbuisse non legimus, excepto illo tantum discipulo, quem intincta bucella magistri proditorem ostenderet, non quæ sacramenti hujus institutionem signaret.

^k Conc. Bracar. III. c. i. (aliis Conc. iv. Vid. Labb. tom. vi. Conc. p. 562.) Quidam eucharistiam, vino madidam, pro complemento communionis credunt populis porrigendam.

^l Microlog. c. xix. Non est authenticum, quod quidam corpus Domini intin-

and that Humbertus *De Sylva Candida*, who wrote against the Greeks in the middle of the eleventh century,^m declaims bitterly against it; though he thinks, with more zeal than he needed to do, for a very good reason we may be sure; because the same practice, as much an abuse as it was, and contrary to the first institution, was not long after authorized in the Roman Church. For Pope Urban the Second, in the Council of Clermont, ordered it, in case of necessity, so to be administered to the sick, and, in other cases, out of abundant caution, for fear the blood should at any time be spilt. However it had various fortune in the Roman Church. For Paschal the Second, not long after, revoked the license of his predecessor;ⁿ and ordered that neither infants nor the sick should have the communion mixed, but rather take the blood alone, which he thought more decent than to give the bread dipped in the cup. Yet this did not satisfy the Council of Tours,^o mentioned by Ivo; for they thought still, that the sick, in case of necessity, ought to have it dipped, that they might have it in both kinds; and that the presbyter who administered it, might say, with truth, "The body and blood

gunt, et intinctum, pro complemento communionis, populo distribuunt; nam Ordo Romanus contradicit.

^m Humbert. Disputat. de Azymo adversus Græcos, (citante Vossio, p. 337, edit. Hag. Com. ex Baronio, tom. xi. p. 694.) Deinde quod sanctum panem vitæ æternæ, in calice intinctum, cum cochleari sumere consuestis, quid opponitis? neque enim ipse Dominus panem in calice vini intrivit, et sic apostolis dedit, dicens, 'Accipite et cum cochleari comedite, hoc est enim corpus meum.' sed, sicut sancta Romana ecclesia usque nunc observat, panem integrum benedixit, et fractum singulis particulatim distribuit, dicens, 'Accipite et comedite; hoc est corpus meum.' Quibus, postquam cœnatum est, calicem porrexit dicens, 'Bibite ex eo omnes.'

ⁿ Paschal. Epist. xxii. ad Pontium, (tom. x. Conc. p. 656.) In sumendo corpore et sanguine Domini Dominica traditio servetur; nec ab eo, quod Christus magister et præcepit et gessit, humana et novella institutione discedatur. Novimus enim, per se panem, per se vinum, ab ipso Domino traditum. Quem morem sic semper in sancta ecclesia conservandum docemus atque præcipimus, præter in parvulis ac omnino infirmis, qui panem absorbere non possunt.

^o Conc. Turon. ap. Ivonem, part. ii. c. xix. Omnis presbyter habeat pyxidem aut vas tanto sacramento dignum, ubi corpus Domini cum diligentia recondatur ad viaticum recedentibus de sæculo. Quæ tantum sacra oblatio intincta debet esse in sanguine Christi, ut veraciter presbyter possit dicere infirmo, 'Corpus et sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi proficiat tibi in remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam.'

of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto thee for remission of sins and eternal life." The men of this age did not yet think it lawful to communicate even the sick in one kind only, nor that the priest could say with truth to the communicant, "The body and blood of Christ," when he did not give him both kinds. But Bona here pities their ignorance: for they, poor men! had not yet learned that noble secret in divinity, the doctrine of concomitancy, to know, that the body of Christ cannot be without the blood. But he goes on to acquaint us, out of an old ritual of Joannes Abrincatensis, that this mixed communion was ordered to be given to all the people likewise, for fear of effusion. And in the ancient customs of the monastery of Cluny, published by Dacherius, there is an order, that the novices should thus communicate, for fear, that if they took the blood by itself, they might incur some negligence and shed it. Though it is intimated in a marginal note there, that the old custom of giving both kinds separately, was used in other churches. In England, the custom of mixing the elements so far prevailed, that Ernulphus, or Arnulphus, bishop of Rochester (an. 1120), wrote a letter in defence of it, which is also published by Dacherius, in his *Spicilegium* (tom. iii.), where one Lambert proposes the question to him; Why the eucharist was administered at present, after a different and almost contrary manner to that which was observed by Jesus Christ; because it was customary, at that time, to distribute a host, steeped in wine, to the communicants; whereas Jesus Christ gave his body and blood separately? To this Arnulphus answers,^p

^p Dacher. *Spicileg.* tom. iii. pp. 471, 472, edit. Paris. 1723, fol. Nos carnem Domini intinguimus in sanguine Domini, ne accipientes sive porrigentes peccemus, non habita forte competenti cautela in labiis et manibus nostris. Evenit enim frequenter, ut barbati, et prolixos habentes granos, dum poculum inter epulas sumunt, prius liquore pilos inficiant, quam ori liquorem infundant. Ii si accesserint ad altare, liquorem sanctum bibituri, quomodo periculum devitare poterunt inter accipiendum, quomodo uterque, accipiens videlicet et porrigens, effugient grande peccatum? Præterea si imberbes, et sine granis, aut mulieres, ad sumendam communionem sanctam conveniant, quis sacerdotum poterit tam provide ministrare, tam caute calicem Domini distribuere, ut multis eum singulatim dividat, dividens sic in ora eorum fundat, ut infundens nihil effundat? Sæpe enim dum sibi soli calicem infundere disponit, negligentia aut imprudentia faciente, effusionis periculum incurrit: quanto facilius in multitudine posito

“That this was one of those things that might be altered ; and, therefore, though anciently the two species of bread and wine were given separately, yet now they were given together ; lest any ill accidents should happen in the distribution of the wine alone ; and lest it should stick on the hairs of the beard or the whiskers, or should be spilt by the minister.” Yet, for all this, not long after, Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, in a synod held at Westminster (an. 1175),⁹ prohibited giving the eucharist steeped in wine as a complement of the communion. Thus this matter was bandied about, and disputed backwards and forwards in the Latin Church ; some allowing it, others condemning it ; now a council settling it, and then another unsettling it, and condemning all that went before them ; till at last the Council of Constance came in with her paramount authority, and (as Bona thinks) very wisely put an end to all these disputes and inconveniences at once, by taking the cup wholly from the people, and ordering that they should neither have it separately nor conjunctly. And so this abuse of giving the eucharist steeped in wine, after a long course and struggle of various fortune was cured with a worse error, which took away the cup from the laity, and denied one part of the sacrament wholly to the people. Let us now return again to the ancient Church.

SECT. III.—*That the Ancients received sometimes standing, sometimes kneeling, but never sitting.*

The next question may be concerning the posture in which they received. The resolution of which must be in these three conclusions:—1. That they sometimes received standing. 2. Sometimes kneeling. 3. Never sitting, that

sacerdoti, multis diversarum formarum ministranti, contingere potest, unde graviter offendat, unde eum asperam pœnitentiam agere oporteat? Ne ergo polluamus sanguinem nostræ redemptionis, ne tamquam impietatis manibus effundamus poculum humanæ salutis, a religiosis viris provide actum est, ut Dominici portiuncula corporis non sicca, sicut Dominum egisse novimus, porrigatur, sed Domini infusa sanguine tribuatur.

⁹ Conc. Westmonaster. c. xi. Inhibemus, ne quis quasi, pro complemento communionis, intinctam alicui eucharistiam tradat.

we read of. That they frequently received the communion standing, may be evidenced two ways : by a direct and by a collateral argument. The direct argument is their positive assertions concerning the standing posture. Thus, Dionysius of Alexandria,^r speaking of one who had often communicated among the faithful, represents him, *τραπίζῃ παραστάντα*, as ‘standing at the Lord’s table.’ Upon which Valesius^a makes this remark ; that, anciently, they received the eucharist standing, not kneeling, as now the custom is. And Habertus undertakes to prove,^t against the Italian divines, as he calls them, that the whole Divine Liturgy was celebrated standing ; and that they both consecrated standing, and received standing. And Bona^u acknowledges the same for the Greek Church, though he is a little more doubtful of the Latin. For the Greek Church, he produces the authority of Chrysostom and Cyril of Jerusalem,^v who bids his communicant receive it, “Bowing his body in the posture of worship and adoration.” Some interpret this ‘kneeling ;’ but it signifies ‘standing with inclination,’ or ‘bowing of the body in the manner of adoration.’ And so St. Chrysostom represents both priest and people as standing

^r Dionys. Epist. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. ix. (Cant. 330, 13.) *Εὐχαριστίας γὰρ ἱσπακούσαντα, καὶ συνισπιθιγζάμενοι τὸ Ἀμήν, καὶ τραπίζῃ παραστάντα, καὶ χεῖρας εἰς ὑποδοχὴν τῆς ἁγίας τροφῆς προτινάντα, κ. τ. λ.*

^a Vales. in loc. p. 129. Fideles communicaturi ad altare accedebant, ibique corpus Christi de manu presbyteri, stantes, non ut hodie, genibus flexis, accipiebant.

^t Habert. Archierat. part. viii. observat. x. pp. 149, 150. Quartus adorandi habitus seu modus est, stando : quod aliquando probandum nobis fuit in gratiam Italorum quorundam, qui ecclesiæ nostræ, Parisiensis metropolitane ritum improbabant, in qua diversis cærimoniis, nunc flexo genu, nunc incliuando, nunc stando, eucharistia adoratur. . . . Totum ergo liturgiæ Dominicæ officium, stando peragebatur. Unde stantes consecrabant, stantes et communicabant.

^u Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. viii. De situ communicantium, si de Græcis sermo sit, nulla est dubitatio, quin stantes dona divina percipiant ; ita enim præscribunt ipsorum Ritualia, quibus consonant sancti Patres : sed prono capite et demissis oculis, ut Cyrillus (Catech. v.), et Chrysostomus (Orat. in Encænâ) monent. De Latinis non ausim adfirmare, nihil enim habeo ex antiquis scriptoribus, quo id confirmem ; nisi quod etiam hodie in missa solemnî Romani Pontificis diaconus communicat stans, omnino ex veteri ritu.

^v Cyril. Catech. v. sect. xix. *Κύπτων, καὶ τρίπη προσκυνήσιος καὶ εὐδίσματος λίγων τὸ Ἀμήν.*

^w Hamon L'Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, chap. vii. p. 209.

at the altar. "This altar," says he,^x speaking of the altar of a man's own soul, sending up, devoutly, prayers and alms to God, "is a more tremendous altar than that whereat thou, who art a layman, standest." And again, "As the priest stands invoking the Spirit, so thou invokest him also; not by thy words, but by thy works." In like manner, St. Austin, representing the Christians' way of worshipping God at the altar, to answer the calumny of the heathen, who accused them of giving Divine worship to their martyrs, says,^y "Which of the faithful ever heard the priest, when he stands at the altar, say, in his prayers, 'I offer sacrifice unto thee, O Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian,' when he offers to God at their monuments or Memorials?" Which I produce here only to shew, that their prayers were then offered in a standing posture at the altar. Upon which account, it was usual for the deacon, at such times, especially on such days as this posture was used, to call upon the people, in some such form of admonition as that mentioned frequently by St. Chrysostom,^z and the author of the Constitutions,^a "Let us stand rightly and devoutly to offer our sacrifices and oblations." Some think Tertullian also refers to this posture when he says,^b "Will not your station be the more solemn, if you also stand at the altar of God?" But, to speak freely, I think Tertullian, in that place, uses the word 'standing,' not to distinguish any particular posture of prayer; but only to denote a longer continuance

^x Chrysostom, Hom. xx. in 2 Cor. p. 836, (p. 589, edit. Francof.) "Ὡς τε τοῦτο (ὑποστατήριον) φρικωδέστερον ἐκείνου, ὃ σὺ παρίστηκας ὁ λαϊκός. . . καθάπερ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἵστηκε τὸ Πνεῦμα καλῶν, οὕτω καὶ σὺ τὸ Πνεῦμα καλεῖς· ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ φωνῆς, ἀλλὰ δι' ἔργων.

^y Aug. de Civit. Dei, lib. viii. c. xxvii. Quis audivit aliquando fœdulum, stantem sacerdotem ad altare, . . . dicere in precibus, 'Offero tibi sacrificium, Petre, vel Paule, vel Cypriane, quum apud eorum memorias offeratur Deo.'—Id. cont. Faust. lib. xx. c. xxi. Quis antistitem, adsistens altari, aliquando dixit, 'Offerimus tibi Petre, aut Paule, aut Cypriane, sed quod offertur, offertur Deo,' &c.

^z Chrysostom. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor. p. 740, (p. 516, edit. Francof.) Hom. xxix. de Incomprehensibili Dei Natura, tom. i. p. 375, (p. 335, edit. Francof.)

^a Constitut. lib. viii. c. xii. 'Ορθοὶ στήμεν καλῶς.

^b Tertul. de Orat. c. xiv. Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris?

in it on the stationary days, or half-fasts, when they continued their religious assemblies till three in the afternoon. For on these days, as we shall hear presently, they prayed always kneeling, though on other days they did not: and, therefore, Tertullian could not mean that they prayed standing on those days, but only that they extended their devotions to a greater length, on those stationary days, beyond others. But, without this controverted passage of Tertullian, there is sufficient evidence, from the foregoing testimonies, of their standing to receive the eucharist at the Lord's table.

And this is further confirmed by a collateral argument, which is, that, on the Lord's day, and all the days of Pentecost, they were obliged to pray standing, and in no other posture, as has been shewed^{bb} at large above. Therefore it is very reasonable to believe, that, at all such times, they received the eucharist in the same posture they were obliged to pray; that is, standing at the altar.

But, then, the usual custom was, on all other days, and particularly on the stationary days, for the whole church to pray kneeling: as has likewise been fully evinced before.^c And, therefore, it is no less reasonable to believe, that they received the communion in the same posture as they prayed, though there are not such positive evidences of their practice. What some allege out of Tertullian, that the people did *arise Dei adgeniculari*, 'kneel down to the altars of God,'^{cc} is no good proof; for that is only a corrupt reading of the first editions, which others, since, read more correctly, *caris Dei adgeniculari*, 'falling at the knees of the favourites of God;' alluding to the custom of penitents falling at the feet of the ministers and people, to beg their prayers for them when they went into the church. Nor is the argument much more solid that others bring out of Cyril's Catechism, where he bids his communicant receive the eucharist, *κύπτων*: for that, as I have observed just now, signifies 'not kneeling,' but 'standing in a bowing posture.' What St. Chrysostom says, in one of his exhortations to communicants,

^{bb} Book xiii. chap. viii. sect. iii. vol. iv. p. 324.

^c Ibid. sect. iv.

^{cc} Tertul. de Pœnitent. c. ix. Paris. 1664, p. 127.

seems more nearly to express it :^d “ Let us come with trembling ; let us give thanks ; let us fall down and confess our sins ; let us weep and lament for our miscarriages ; let us pour out fervent prayers to God ; and let us come with a becoming reverence as to our heavenly King.” But, if there were none of these expressions, the very custom of kneeling at prayers on these days is a sufficient indication of the posture in which, at the same time, they received the communion.

As to sitting, there is no example of it, nor any intimation leading toward it, in any ancient writer. I have shewed before, that, in many churches, they allowed no sitting at all in time of Divine service, neither in preaching, nor reading the Scriptures, nor in psalmody, nor in praying, nor after praying, neither ; and it would be unreasonable to imagine, that what was rejected at all other times, should be allowed in receiving the communion. Cardinal Perron, indeed, labours hard to prove, that the apostles received sitting, and that sitting was also a posture of adoration ; but his vanity is abundantly chastised and exposed by the learned Daillé, as I have noted before,^{dd} upon another occasion : so that this posture is wholly without example in the ancient Church. Nor are there many examples of it among the moderns ; and of those that be, some of them are such, as, considering their motives, one would, least of all, choose to imitate them. The Arians, in Poland, are said to receive the communion sitting, to shew that they do not believe Christ to be their God, but only their fellow-creature : for which reason, some of the Protestant Polish synods^e ex-

^d Chrysostom. Hom. xxxi. in Natal. Christi, tom. v. p. 480, (hom. xxxiii. p. 429, edit. Francof.) *Φρίξομεν τοίνυν προσιόντες, ὑψαριστήσωμεν, προσπίσωμεν ἱερομολογούμενοι τὰ πταίσματα ἡμῶν, δακρύσωμεν, τὰ οἰκτῖα πεινθούντες κακὰ, ἱκτινῆς ὑψὺς ἀποδῶμεν τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ οὕτω διακαθάραντες ἑαυτοὺς, ἥριμα καὶ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης ὑπαξίας, ὡς τῷ Βασιλεῖ προσιόντες τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὕτω προσίλωμεν.*

^{dd} Book xiii. c. viii. sect. vii. Bingham, vol. iv. p. 333.

^e Synod. Wlodislav. an. 1583, art. vi. in Corpore Confess. part. ii. p. 309. Sententia jam olim in Sendomiriensi synodo agitata, et conclusio in generali Cracoviensi atque Petricoviensi synodo facta ac repetita, in hoc etiam consensu approbata est : nempe ne in usu sit sessio ad mensam Dominicam in ullis hujus nostri consensus ecclesiis. Nam hæc cærimonia, licet cum ceteris libera, eccle-

pressly forbid this posture, as peculiar to the Arians, and obliged all their people to receive either standing or kneeling, not sitting, as being a posture taken up by the Arians, and contrary to the practice of all Protestant Churches. We are likewise told, that it is the singular privilege of the pope to communicate sitting, whenever he performs the office of consecration. Bona^f not only tells us this, but describes the whole ceremony out of the book called *Ceremoniale Romani Pontificis*, and the old *Ordo Romanus*; which they that are curious in such matters, may consult in their proper places. I go on with the practice of the ancient Church.

siis Christianis et cœtibus evangelicis non est usitata, tantumque infidelibus Arianis, cum Domino pari solio collocantibus, propria, &c. — Vid. Synod. Petricoviens. art. iv. ibid. 306. — Synod. Cracoviens. art. iv. p. 303.

^f Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. viii. (Antwerp. 1677, p. 593.) Summus pontifex, quum solemniter celebrat, sedens, communicat hoc modo. Data pace, episcopo et duobus diaconis adstantibus, qui os ejus et pectus osculantur, adscendit ad sedem suam, comitantibus ipsum diaconis et episcopis. Tum diaconus evangelii apud altare patenam cum sacramento reverenter accipiens, ambabus manibus in altum elevat usque ad oculos, habentem desuper auream stellam cum nominibus xii. apostolorum, ne hostia labi possit. Et primo vertit se ad latus epistolæ cum summa gravitate, et per eandem viam revertitur ad medium altaris: postea eodem modo vertit se ad latus evangelii, ubi subdiacono genuflexo patenam tradit cum sacramento. Tum surgit subdiaconus, et ipse diaconus flectit genua, donec ille discesserit, portans sacramentum pontifici, qui ei advenienti profunde inclinat, ac ipsum reverenter adorat. Subdiaconus vero, quum pervenerit ad pontificem, stat rectus ad ejus sinistram. Post hæc diaconus accipiens calicem, parvo velo aureo coopertum, eodem modo se vertit ad utrumque latus altaris, sicut cum patenam tenebat: et inde cum ipso calice ad dextrum latus pontificis accedit. Pontifex vero sumit unam partem hostiæ, et aliam in duas partes dividit pro communione diaconi et subdiaconi. Sumto autem a pontifice Christi corpore, episcopus cardinalis adsistens porrigit ei calamus aureum, quo sanguinis partem sugit, residuum dimittens pro diacono et subdiacono. Tum pontifex communicat diaconum stantem et tenentem dextera manu calicem, calamus sinistra; qui, accepto corpore Christi, faciem pontificis osculatur, et reversus ad altare partem sanguinis sugit. Eodem modo corpus Christi porrigit pontifex subdiacono coram se genuflexo et patenam tenenti, qui et ipse ad cornu altaris accedens, residuum sanguinis cum calamo sugit. Unus autem ex ipsis particulam hostiæ, quæ calici de more immissa fuerat, ad labia ipsius calicis retrahit et sumit. Hæc ex cærimoniali Romani pontificis excerpta sunt, quæ ab antiquissimo Ordine Romano in paucis discrepant, ut utrumque conferenti manifestum erit.

SECT. IV.—*No Elevation of the Host for Divine Adoration in the Ancient Church for many Ages, till the Rise of Transubstantiation.*

There is no one thing that has made greater stir and confusion in the Christian world, for some ages passed, than the adoration of the host, grounded upon a false presumption, that it is not bread and wine, but transubstantiated into the real body and blood of Christ. I intend not to enter upon the history of transubstantiation (which is a doctrinal point, and comes not properly into this work, which only inquires into the practice of the Church), but shall content myself to say, that, in fact, the most eminent of the ancient fathers have declared, as plain as words can make it, that the change, made in the elements of bread and wine by consecration, is not such a change as destroys their nature and substance; but only alters their qualities, and elevates them to a spiritual use, as is done in many other consecrations, where the qualities of things are much altered, without any real change of substance. Thus Gregory Nyssen:^s “This altar, before which we stand, is but common stone in its nature, differing nothing from other stones, wherewith our walls are built: but, after it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a benediction, it is a holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be touched by any but by the priests, and that with the greatest reverence. The bread

^s Nyssen. de Bapt. Christ. tom. iii. pp. 369, 370, (Paris. 1615, vol. ii. p. 801, D.) Τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦτο τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ παριστήκαμεν, λίθος ἵστί κατὰ τὴν φύσιν κοινὸς, οὐδὲν διαφέρειν τῶν ἄλλων πλακῶν, αἱ τοὺς τοίχους ἡμῶν οἰκοδομοῦσι, καὶ καλῶς πίξουσιν τὰ ἰδάρη. Ἐπειδὴν δὲ καθιερώθη τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ θυσιασίᾳ, καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν ἰδίχαστο, ἵστί ἑράσιζα ἅγια, θυσιαστήριον ἔχραντον, οὐκίτι παρὰ πάντων ψηλαφώμενον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῶν ἱερίων, καὶ τούτων ὑπακούμενον. ὁ ἄρτος πάλιν ἄρτος ἵστί τῶν κοινός· ἀλλ’ ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸ μυστήριον ἱερουργήσῃ, εὖμα Χριστοῦ λίγνται τε καὶ γίνονται. οὕτως τὸ μυστικὸν ἔλαιον, οὕτως ὁ οἶνος, ἰλίγου τινὲς ἄξια ὄντα πρὸ τῆς εὐλογίας, μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἐκάντερον αὐτῶν ἱεργὴ διαφύρεσι. ἡ αὐτὴ δὲ τοῦ λόγου δύναμις, καὶ τὸν ἱερίαν ποιῶ σιμὸν καὶ τίμιον τῇ κοινοτήτι τῆς εὐλογίας τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς κοινοτήτης χωρεῖ μένον. χρεῖς γὰρ καὶ πρῶτη εἰς ὑπάρχων τῶν πολλῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου, ἀθρόον ἀποδείκνυται καθηγουμένων, πρεσβυτέρων, διδάσκαλων ἐπισκόπων, μυστηρίων λαμβάνοντων μυσταγωγός· καὶ ταῦτα ποιῶ, μετὰ τοῦ σώματος ἡ τῆς μορφῆς ἀμειψθείς· ἀλλ’ ὑπάρχων κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐκείνος, ὃς ἦν, ἀεράτω τινὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι τὴν ἀόρατον ψυχὴν μεταμορφωθείς πρὸς τὸ βίλσιον.

also, at first, is but common bread; but, when once it is sanctified by the holy mystery, it is made and called the body of Christ. So the mystical oil, and so the wine, though they be things of little value before the benediction, yet, after their sanctification by the Spirit, they both of them work wonders. The same power of the word makes a priest become honourable and venerable, when he is separated from the community of the vulgar by a new benediction; for he who before was only one of the common people, is now immediately made a ruler and president, a teacher of piety, and a minister of the holy mysteries. And all these things he does without any change in his body or shape; for, to all outward appearance, he is the same that he was; but the change is in his invisible soul, by an invisible power and grace." Cyril of Jerusalem^b uses the same similitude and illustration: "Beware that you take not this ointment to be bare ointment. For as the bread in the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ; so this holy ointment, after invocation, is not bare or common ointment, but it is the gift, or grace of Christ, and the Holy Spirit, who, by his presence and Divine nature, makes it efficacious; so that the body is anointed symbolically with the visible ointment, but the soul is sanctified by the holy and quickening Spirit." St. Chrysostom, in his famous Epistle to Cæsarius, makes a like comparison, to explain the two natures of Christ against the Apollinarians, to shew that he had both a human and Divine substance in reality, without any transformation or confusion. "As the bread," says he,ⁱ "before it is sanctified, is called

^b Cyril. Catech. Mystag. iii. sect. iii. p. 525. "Ὅρα, μὴ ὑπονοήσης ἐκείνο τὸ μῆρον ψιλὸν εἶναι ἄσπερον καὶ ὁ ἄσπερος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔτι ἄσπερος λυτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μῆρον, οὐκ ἔστι ψιλόν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν μετ' ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ χάρισμα, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου παρουσία τῆς αὐτοῦ θείας φύσεως ἐνεργητικὸν γινόμενον, ὅστις συμβολικῶς ἐπὶ μιτάσπου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σου χρίσται αἰσθητηρίων· καὶ τῷ μὲν φαινομένῳ μύρῳ τὸ σῶμα χρίσται, τῷ δὲ ἁγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ Πνεύματι ἡ ψυχὴ ἁγιάζεται.

ⁱ Apud Albertin. de Sacram. Eucharistiæ, lib. ii. c. i. p. 532. Sicut antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus, Divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione, etsi natura panis in ipso per-

bread, but after the Divine grace has sanctified it by the mediation of the priest, it is no longer called bread, but dignified with the name of the body of the Lord, though the nature of bread remain in it, and they are not said to be two, but one body of the Son; so, here, the Divine nature, residing or dwelling in the human body, they both, together, make one Son and one person." When this passage was first produced by Peter Martyr, it was looked upon as so unanswerable, that they of the Romish Church had no other way to evade the force of it, but to cry out, "It was a forgery." Peter Martyr left it in the Lambeth library, but it was ravished thence in the reign of Queen Mary. Bigotius, a learned French papist, published the original; but the whole edition was suppressed. Yet Le Moine published it again in Latin, among his *Varia Sacra*; and a learned prelate, who now so deservedly holds the primacy in our own Church, and whose indefatigable industry against popery will never be forgotten, having procured the sheets which the Sorbonne doctors caused to be suppressed in Bigotius's edition of Palladius, published it in our own tongue,¹ with such of the Greek fragments as are now remaining. And in these monuments it will stand as the unanswerable testimony of St. Chrysostom, and a key to explain all other passages of the Greek writers of that age, who were, undoubtedly, in the same sentiments, of the bread and wine still remaining unalterable in their substance.

Theodoret lived not long after St. Chrysostom, and he as plainly says that the bread and wine remain still in their own nature after consecration. "Our Saviour," says he,^k

mansit, et non duo corpora, sed unum Filii corpus prædicatur; sic et hæc divina *ἰνδρευσάσης*, inundante corporis natura (legendum, hæc divina insidente corpori natura) unum Filium, unam personam, utraque hæc fecerunt.

¹ Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against Mr. de Meaux, London, 1686.

^k Theodoret. Dialog. i. tom. iv. p. 18, (Hal. 1772, vol. iv. p. 26.) 'Ἐβουλήθη (ὁ Σωτὴρ) τοὺς τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταλαγχάνοντας, μὴ τῇ φύσει τῶν βλισπομένων προσίχυν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἰναλλαγῆς, πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γιγνημένη μεταβολῇ. ὁ γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα σίτον καὶ ἄρτον προσαναγορεύσας, καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἑαυτὸν ἔμπειλον ὀνομάσας, οὗτος τὰ ἱεράμυνα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορίᾳ τιτίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστιθεὶς.

“ would have those, who are partakers of the Divine mysteries, not to mind the nature of the things they see, but, by the change of names, to believe that change which is wrought by grace; for he that called his own natural body wheat and bread, and gave it the name of a vine, he also honoured the visible symbols or elements with the name of his body and blood, not changing their nature, but adding grace to nature.” In another place¹ he uses the very same weapon to foil an Eutychian heretic, who, to prove that Christ’s human nature was changed into the Divine nature after union, uses this argument: “ As the symbols of the Lord’s body and blood are one thing before the invocation of the priest, but after invocation are changed, and become another thing; so also the body of our Lord, after its assumption, was changed into the Divine substance.” To which Theodoret thus replies: “ Thou art taken in thy own nets, which thou hast made · for neither do the mystical symbols depart from their own nature after consecration, but remain in their former substance, figure, and form, and are visible and palpable, as they were before; yet they are understood and believed to be what they are made, and are revered as those things which they are made. Compare, therefore, the image with the original, and thou shalt see their likeness: for the type must answer to the truth. That body has the same form, and figure, and circumscription, and, in a word, has the same substance of a body that it had before; but it is immortal after the resurrection, and is freed from

¹ Theodoret. Dialog. ii. p. 85, (p. 126.) ἘΠΑΝΙΣΤΗΣ. ὁμοίως τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ δισποτικοῦ σώματος τε καὶ αἵματος, ἄλλα μὲν εἰσι πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλησίως, μετὰ δὲ γιὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλονται, καὶ ἴτερα γίνονται· οὕτω τὸ δισποτικὸν σῶμα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μεταβλήθη τὴν θείαν. ὉΡΘΟΔΟΜΟΣ. Ἐάλωσις ὕφηντις ἀρεσκύν· οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς εὐκρίσεως ἐξίσταται φύσις. μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτίρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἴσται, καὶ ἀπτά, οἷα καὶ πρῶτον ἦν νοεῖται διὰ τῶν ἱγνίτων, καὶ πιστεύονται, καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκείνα ὄντα ἅπαν πιστεύονται. παρὰ τούτων τοίνυν τῶν ἀρχιτύπων τὴν εἰκόνα, καὶ ὅψιν τὴν ὁμοίωσιν. χρὴ γὰρ εὐκρίναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τὸν τύπον. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνο τὸ σῶμα τὸ μὲν πρῶτον εἶδος ἔχει, καὶ σχῆμα, καὶ περιγεαφῆν, καὶ ἀπαξιαπλῶς ἵπται, τὴν τοῦ σώματος οὐσίαν. ἀβάντων δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν γίγονι, καὶ κρεῖττον φθορᾶς, καὶ τῆς ἐκ διζίων ἡζιώθη καθύπερθε, καὶ παρὰ πάσης προσκυνεῖται τῆς κτίσεως, ὅτι δὴ σῶμα χρηματίζον τοῦ Δισπότου τῆς φύσεως.

all corruption, and sits at God's right hand, and is adored by every creature, as being called the body of the Lord of nature." These words are so plain, that the bread continues in its own substance after consecration, as the body of Christ continues in the substance of human nature after its assumption, that, as Bishop Cosins^m has observed, Nicolin, the pope's printer, who set forth these dialogues at Rome (an. 1547), owns "that Theodoret's opinion, as to what concerns transubstantiation, was not sound; but he might be excused, because the Church had made no decree about it."

Ephraem, bishop of Antioch, lived about a hundred years after Theodoret (an. 540); and he wrote against the Eutychians in the same manner. "No man," says he,ⁿ "that hath any reason, will say, the nature of palpable and impalpable, of visible and invisible, is the same. For so the body of Christ, which is received by the faithful, does not depart from its own sensible substance, and yet it is united to a spiritual grace. And so baptism, though it becomes wholly a spiritual thing, and but one thing, yet it preserves the property of its sensible substance: I mean water, and does not lose what it was before."

The Latin fathers are not less plain and full in their testimony about this matter. Tertullian not only frequently says, "It is bread, representing the Lord's body,"^o and the

^m Cosins's History of Transubstantiation, p. 77.

ⁿ Ephrem. ap. Photium, cod. ccxxxix. p. 793. Οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐκ δύο φύσεων λίγοντες τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συγκιῖσθαι, ἐκ δύο νοῦσιν οὐσίῳν ὥσπερ καὶ ἡνίκα ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, ἐν δυσὶν οὐσίαις· καὶ ὁ τῆς βροτῆς δι' οὗτος τοῦτο διδάσκει ἐν τῷ λίγῳ, "Ὁ ὃν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ ἰωράκαμιν, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν περὶ τοῦ Λόγου τῆς ζωῆς. τὸν ἵνα γὰρ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ὧν ἔφημιν, καὶ ψηλαφητὴν οὐσίαν ἔχον καὶ ἀψηλάφητον ἀνεκέρυξι· λόγον γὰρ εἰπῶν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον ψηλαφηθῆναι προσμαρτύρησι. καὶ ἰωρακίνας εἰπῶν, τὸν ἀόρατον προσηγγίλιν ὥστε τὸν ἵνα Χριστὸν ἐν ψηλαφητῇ καὶ ἀψηλαφήτῃ οὐσίᾳ, καὶ ἐν ἐρατῇ καὶ ἀεράτῃ γινώριζεται, καὶ τοῖς ἔλλοις ἰδῖναι διδάσκαλος γίνεται. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἰνὸς προσώπου [καὶ] ἰκάτερον, ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς ἂν εἰπῇ δύναται νοῦν ἔχον, ὡς ἡ αὐτὴ φύσις ψηλαφητοῦ καὶ ἀψηλαφήτου, καὶ ἐρατοῦ καὶ ἀεράτου· οὕτω καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται. καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαίρητον μίνοι χάριτος· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα δι' πνευματικὸν, ὅλον γινόμενον καὶ ἐν ὑπάρχον, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας, τοῦ ὕδατος λίγω, διασώζω, καὶ ὁ γίγοντι οὐκ ἀπώλειται.

^o Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. i. c. xiv. Panem, quo ipsum corpus suum representat.

figure of his body;"^p but also teaches us to trust to the testimony of our senses, in this and many other things relating to Christ.^q "We are not to call in question those senses of ours, lest we begin to doubt of the certainty of the very things that are related of Christ, whether he was not deceived, when he saw Satan fall from heaven; or when he heard the Father's voice testifying of him; or when he touched the hand of Peter's mother; or when he smelled the spirit of the ointment which he accepted to his burial; or when he tasted the wine that he consecrated to be the memorial of his blood. St. John argues upon the testimony of our senses, 'What we have seen, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the word of life.' But this attestation is false, if our senses may be deceived in the nature of things, which we see with our eyes, and hear with our ears, and touch with our hands." It is plain, from these words of Tertullian, that he never thought of transubstantiation, which contradicts four of the five senses of all mankind: the sight, the touch, the taste, and the smell; and that he must be the most absurd man that ever wrote, if, after all, he could believe that not to be bread, which, according to his own rule, had the testimony of so many several senses.

St. Austin uses the same argument with Tertullian in one of his homilies to the newly-baptized, which, though it be not now among St. Austin's works, yet it is preserved by

^p Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. iv. c. xl. Panem corpus suum fecit, 'Hoc est corpus meum' dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei.

^q Ibid. de Anima, c. xvii. p. 276, B. Non licet nobis in dubium sensus istos devocare, ne et in Christo de fide eorum deliberetur. Ne forte dicatur, quod falso Satanam prospectarit de cælo præcipitatum: aut falso vocem Patris audierit de ipso testificatam: aut deceptus sit, quum Petri socrum tetigit: aut alium postea unguenti senserit spiritum, quod in sepulturam suam acceptavit: alium postea vini saporem, quod in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit. Sic enim et Marcion phantasma eum maluit credere, totius corporis in illo dedignatus veritatem. Atquin ne in apostolis quidem ejus ludificata natura est. Fidelis fuit et visus et auditus in monte: fidelis et gustus vini illius, licet aquæ ante, in nuptiis Galilææ: fidelis et tactus, exinde creduli Thomæ. Recita Joannis testimonium: 'Quod vidimus,' inquit, 'quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus, et manus nostræ contrectaverunt, de sermone vitæ.' Falsa utique testatio, si oculorum et aurium et manuum sensus natura mentitur.

Fulgentius, and Bede, and Bertram.^r Here instructing them about the sacrament, he tells them, "That what they saw upon the altar, was bread and the cup, as their own eyes could testify to them; but, what their faith required to be instructed about was, that the bread is the body of Christ, and the cup the blood of Christ. But such a thought as this will presently arise in your hearts: Christ took his body into heaven, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the

^r Fulgent. de Baptism. Æthiopis, c. xi. (Paris. 1661, p. 612.) — Beda, in 1 Cor. x. — Bertram. de Corpore et Sanguine Dom. Hoc quod videtis in altari Dei, etiam transacta nocte vidistis: sed quid esset, quam magnæ rei sacramentum contineret, nondum audistis. Quod ergo videtis, panis est et calix: quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renuntiant. Quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi, calix sanguis Christi. Breviter quidem hoc dictum est, quod fidei forte sufficiat: sed fides instructionem desiderat. Dicit enim propheta, 'Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis.' Potestis ergo dicere mihi, Præcepisti ut credamus: expone, ut intelligamus. Potest enim in animo cujuspiam cogitatio talis oboriri. Dominus noster Jesus Christus novimus unde acceperit carnem de virgine. Infans lactatus est, nutritus est, crevit, ad juvenilem ætatem perductus est, a Judæis persecutionem passus est, ligno suspensus est, in ligno interfectus est, de ligno depositus est, sepultus est, tertia die resurrexit, quo die voluit, in cælum adscendit. Illuc levavit corpus suum, unde est venturus, ut judicet vivos et mortuos. Ibi est modo sedens ad dextram Patris. Quomodo est panis corpus ejus? et calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus? Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur, speciem habet corporalem; quod intelligitur, fructum habet spirituale. Corpus ergo Christi si vis intelligere, apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus, 'Vos estis corpus Christi et membra.' Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa Domini positum est: mysterium Domini accipitis. Ad id, quod estis, 'Amen' respondetis, et respondendo subscribitis. Audis ergo corpus Christi, et respondes, 'Amen.' Esto membrum corporis Christi, ut verum sit Amen. Quare ergo in pane? Nihil heic de nostro adferamus: ipsum apostolum item audiamus. Quum ergo de isto sacramento loqueretur, ait, 'Unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus.' Intelligite et gaudete. Unitas, pietas, veritas, caritas, unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus. Recolite enim, quia panis non fit de uno grano, sed de multis. Quando exorcizabamini, quasi molebamini: quando baptizati estis, quasi conspersi estis; quando Spiritus Sancti ignem accepistis, quasi cocti estis. Estote quod videtis, et accipite quod estis. Hoc apostolus de pane dixit: jam de calice quid intelligeremus, etiam hoc dictum satis ostendit. Sicut enim ut sit species visibilis panis, multa grana in unum consperguntur, tamquam illud fiat, quod de fidelibus ait Sacra Scriptura, 'Erat illis anima et cor unum in Deum;' sic et de vino, fratres, recolite, unde sit unum. Grana multa pendent ad botrum; sed liquor granorum in unitate confunditur. Ita Dominus noster Jesus Christus nos significavit, nos ad se pertinere voluit; mysterium pacis et unitatis nostræ in sua mensa consecravit. Qui accipit mysterium unitatis, et non servat vinculum pacis, non mysterium accipit pro se, sed testimonium contra se.

dead ; and there he now sits at the right hand of the Father. How then is bread his body ? Or how is the cup, or that which is contained in the cup, his blood ? These things, my brethren, are, therefore, called sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, and another is understood. That which is seen, has a bodily appearance ; that which is understood, has a spiritual fruit. If, therefore, you would understand the body of Christ, hear what the apostle says to the faithful : ‘Ye are the body of Christ, and his members.’ If, therefore, ye be the body and members of Christ, your mystery, or sacrament, is laid upon the Lord’s table, ye receive the sacrament of the Lord. Ye answer, ‘Amen,’ to what ye are, and by your answer subscribe to the truth of it. Thou hearest the minister say to thee, ‘The body of Christ,’ and thou answerest, ‘Amen.’ Be thou a member of the body of Christ, that thy ‘Amen’ may be true. But why, then, is this mystery in bread ? Let us here bring nothing of our own, but hear the apostle speak again. When he, therefore, speaks of this sacrament, he says, ‘We, being many, are one bread, and one body.’ Understand and rejoice. We, being many, are unity, piety, truth, and charity : one bread, and one body. Recollect and consider, that the bread is not made of one grain, but of many. When ye were exorcized, ye were then, as it were, ground : when ye were baptized, ye were, as it were, sprinkled, or mixed and wet together into one mass : when ye received the fire of the Holy Ghost, ye were, as it were, baked. Be ye, therefore, what ye see, and receive what ye are.” Here St. Austin first says, plainly, That it was bread and wine that was upon the altar ; for which he appeals to the testimony of their senses. 2. That this very bread and wine is the body and blood of Christ ; consequently it could not be his natural body in the substance, but only sacramentally. 3. He says, the natural body of Christ is only in heaven, but the sacrament has the name of his body ; because, though in outward, visible, and corporeal appearance, it is only bread, yet it is attended with a spiritual fruit. 4. Lastly, he says, that the sacrament not only is a representative of the natural body of Christ, but also of the mystical body, the Church ; and that, as a

symbol of the Church's unity, it is called the body of Christ in this sense, as well as the other. So that if there were any real transubstantiation, the bread must be changed into the mystical body of Christ; that is, his Church, as well as into the body natural. These things might be confirmed from abundance of parallel passages in St. Austin's works, but this one is sufficient to shew his meaning.

The next irrefragable testimony is that of Pope Gelasius, who wrote against the Nestorians and Eutychians, about the reality of the two natures in Christ (an. 490), where he thus proves them: "Doubtless the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which we receive, are a Divine thing; and, therefore, by them we are made partakers of the Divine nature, and yet the substance and nature of bread and wine do not cease to be in them; and, indeed, the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the mysterious action. By this, therefore, is evidently shewed us, that we are to believe the same thing in our Lord Christ, as we profess, and celebrate, and take in his image: that as, by the perfecting virtue of the Holy Ghost, the elements pass into a Divine substance, whilst their nature still remains in its own propriety; so in that principal mystery (the union of the Divine and human nature), whose efficacy and power these represent, there remains one true and perfect Christ, both natures, of which he consists, continuing in their properties unchangeable." He must be blind that cannot see, how the force of this argument supposes, that bread and wine continue in their proper nature and substance in the eucharist, notwithstanding the sacramental

* Gelas. de Duab. Natur. cont. Nestor. et Eutych. Bibl. Patr. tom. iv. p. 422, (tom. viii. p. 703, edit. Lugd. 1677.) Certe sacramenta, quæ sumimus, corporis et sanguinis Domini, Divina res est, propter quod et per eadem Divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo evidenter ostenditur hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profiteamur, celebramus, et sumimus; ut sicut in hanc, scilicet in Divinam transeunt, Spiritu Sancto perficiente, substantiam, permanente tamen in sua proprietate natura [ita enim evidenter legendum est] sic illud ipsum mysterium principale (unio Divinæ et humanæ naturæ) cujus vobis efficientiam virtutemque repræsentat, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere.

union that is made between them and the body of Christ by the sacred use of them. Without this, it had been of no force against the Eutychians; and they might, with a very obvious reply, have inverted the argument upon him, by saying, that as the bread was changed from its own nature into the very substance of the natural body of Christ, and remained no longer bread; so the human nature was really changed into the Divine nature, and continued no longer in its own substance, after its assumption into the Godhead. Which argument, in the mouth of an Eutychian, had been unanswerable to Gelasius, had he, with his successors, given in to the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Some time after Gelasius lived Facundus, an African bishop (about the year 550); he wrote to excuse Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, for saying, that Christ received the adoption of sons, which he does after this manner:^t “Christ vouchsafed to receive the sacrament of adoption, both when he was circumcised, and when he was baptized. Now the sacrament of adoption may be called adoption, as we call the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, his body and blood; not because the bread is properly his body, or the cup his blood, but because they contain the mystery of his body and blood. Whence our Saviour, when he blessed the bread and cup, and gave them to his disciples, called them his body and blood.” It is plain, according to Facundus, that the bread and wine are not, properly, the body and blood of Christ, but, properly,

^t Facund. lib. ix. c. v. Adoptionem quoque filiorum suscepisse Christum, si antiqui doctores ecclesiæ dixisse monstrarentur, nec ipsi, nec omnis ecclesia, quæ tales doctores habuit, judicari deberent hæretici. Nam sacramentum adoptionis suscipere dignatus est Christus, et quando circumciscus est, et quando baptizatus est: et potest sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari, sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus, non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis, sed quod in se mysterium corporis sanguinisque contineant. Hinc et ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem, quem discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem suum vocavit. Quocirca, sicut Christi fideles, sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus accipientes, corpus et sanguinem Christi recte dicuntur accipere; sic et ipse Christus, sacramentum adoptionis filiorum quum suscepisset, potuit recte dici adoptionem filiorum suscepisse.

bread and wine still; and only called his body and blood, as baptism and circumcision are called adoption, because they are the sacraments of adoption, and not the very thing which they represent.

To these I only add the testimony of Isidore, bishop of Seville, who lived in the beginning of the seventh century (an. 630). He, speaking of the rites of the Church, says,^u “The bread, because it nourishes and strengthens our bodies, is therefore called the body of Christ; and the wine, because it creates blood in our flesh, is called the blood of Christ. Now these two things are visible, but, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, they become the sacrament of the Lord’s body.” Bertram also quotes a like expression out of Isidore’s *Origines*:^w “That as the visible substance of bread and wine nourish the outward man, so the word of Christ, who is the Bread of Life, refresheth the souls of the faithful, being received by faith.” But, as Bishop Cosins and Mr. Albertin have observed, this passage, by some pious fraud, is not to be found in its proper place. Now, if the bread be such bread in substance as nourishes the body, then it must be such as is properly bread still, and not the incorruptible body of Christ, which cannot be said to be cast out into the draught, which yet Origen says of it:^x “That

^u Isidor. Hispalens. de Eccles. Offic. lib. i. c. xviii. (Rom. 1802, vol. vi. p. 383.) Panis quem frangimus, corpus Christi est, qui dixit, ‘Ego sum panis vivus,’ &c. Vinum autem sanguis ejus est; et hoc est, quod scriptum est, ‘Ego sum vitis vera.’ Sed panis quia corpus confirmat, ideo corpus Christi nuncupatur; vinum autem, quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur. Hæc autem duo sunt visibilia; sanctificata autem per Spiritum Sanctum, in sacramentum Divini corporis transeunt.

^w Bertram. de Corp. et Sanguin. Dom. ex Isidor. Orig. lib. vi. c. xix. (apud Flac. Catal. Test. Verit. lib. x. p. 1065, edit. Genev. 1608.) Panis et vinum ideo corpori et sanguini Domini comparantur, quia sicut visibilibus hujus panis vinique substantia exteriorem nutrit et inebriat hominem; ita verbum Dei, qui est Panis Vivus, participatione sui fidelium recreat mentes.

^x Origen. Comment. in Matth. xv. tom. ii. p. 27, (p. 16, m. p. 17, a. edit. Paris. 1604.) Εἰ δὲ πᾶν, τὸ ἐσθαρῶμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα, εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφιδρωῖα ἐκβάλλεται, καὶ τὸ ἀγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντιύξεως, κατ’ αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφιδρωῖα ἐκβάλλεται· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγινομένην αὐτῷ εὐχὴν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ἀφίλιμους γίνονται, κ. τ. λ. (Wirceburg, vol. x. p. 460.) Dixit quispiam in hunc locum (‘Non quod os ingreditur, polluit hominem’) incidens, quod sicut quod ingreditur in os,

the material part of the sacrament, the typical and symbolical body of Christ, which goes in at the mouth, goes into the belly; but the real body of Christ is only received by those that are worthy, and by faith." By all which it is evident, the ancients did not know any thing of the new doctrine of transubstantiation; but believed that the bread and wine still remained in the eucharist, in their proper nature. He that would see more of this, may consult Bishop Cosins's History of Transubstantiation, and Mr. Albertin's elaborate book of the Eucharist,⁷ where he may find all the other arguments against this doctrine proposed, and the testimonies of every father vindicated against the sophistry of Perron and Bellarmin, and all other Romish writers upon this subject; and also see what opposition was made to the new hypothesis of Paschasius Rathbertus (which was rather a consubstantiation than a transubstantiation), as soon as it appeared, by Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, Walafridus Strabo, Heribaldus, Lupus, Frudegardus, Joannes Erigena,

non polluit hominem, etiam si putetur a Judæis pollutum; ita quod ingreditur in os, non sanctificat hominem, etiamsi a simplicioribus credatur sanctificare, nimirum is, qui vocatur panis Domini. Et est, ni fallor, oratio non contemnenda, eoque desiderans dilucidam expositionem, quæ mihi talis videtur. Quemadmodum non cibus, sed conscientia cum hæsitacione vescentis polluit edentem, eo quod qui hæsitat, si vescatur, judicatus est, quia non ex fide; et quemadmodum nihil est impurum per se polluto et incredulo, sed propter ipsius immunditiam et incredulitatem, ita quod sanctificatur per verbum Dei et orationem, non suapte natura sanctificat utentem. Nam si id esset, sanctificaret etiam illum, qui comedit indigne; neque quisquam ob hunc esum infirmus aut ægrotus fuisset, aut obdormisset. Nam tale quiddam Paulus demonstrat, quum ait, 'Propter hoc in vobis infirmi et male valentes, et dormiunt multi.' Proinde etiam in pane Domini tum utilitas est vescendi, cum impolluta mente puraque conscientia particeps est illius. Sic quod ad esum per se attinet, nec ex hoc, quia non edimus de pane, per verbum Dei et obsecrationem sanctificato, fraudamur aliquo bono, nec ex edendo abundamus aliquo bono: si quidem causa defectus est malitia peccataque, et abundantia causa est justitia et recte facta. Ut tale sit, quod dicitur apud Paulum his verbis, 'Neque si comederimus, abundabimus; neque si non comederimus, minus habebimus.' Quodsi quidquid ingreditur in os, in ventrem abit, et in secessum ejicitur, et ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei et orationem, juxta id quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit, et in secessum ejicitur. Ceterum juxta precationem, quæ illi accessit, proportionem fidei fit utilis, efficiens, ut perspicax sit animus, spectans ad id quod utile est. Nec materia panis, sed super illum dictus sermo est, qui prodest non indigne Domino comedenti illum. Et hæc quidem de typico symbolicoque corpore.

⁷ Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. iii. p. 921, seqq.

Prudentius Tricassinus, Christianus Druthmarus, Alfricus, and the Saxon homilies, Fulbertus Carnotensis, Leuthe-ricus Senonensis, Berno Augiensis, and others, to the time of Berengarius; after whom it met with greater opposition from Honorius Augustodunensis, Amalricus, Peter and Henry de Bruis, Guido Grossus, archbishop of Narbonne, Francus Abbas, the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Bohe-mians, and followers of John Huss, and Jerom of Prague, the Wicklevists here in England, among whom was the famous Reginald Peacock, and many other learned men, to the time of the Reformation. The first inventor of the name 'transubstantiation' was Stephen Eduensis,^a as Albertin there shews: and he lived not long before the Council of Lateran, which first dogmatically established it (an. 1215). He shews, that before this they rather believed an impa-nation, or concomitancy of the body with the bread still remaining. Bishop Cosins has many curious remarks of the same nature: and particularly he observes of the recantation, which Pope Nicholas II. obliged Berengarius to make, that it was so crude and absurd, that even the present Romanists cannot digest it; for there he was obliged to profess, "That the very body and blood of Christ was touched and broken by the hands of the priest, and ground with the teeth of the faithful, not sacramentally only, but in truth, and sensibly." Which the glosser upon Gratian, John Semeca, marks with this note,^a "That unless you understand it cautiously, it will lead into a greater heresy than that of Berengarius; for it

^a Ibid. p. 969. Tunc novitium transubstantiationis figmentum, novo hoc nomine eo usque non vocitatum, illo cœpit commendari. Nomenclator ei Stephanus episcopus Eduensis, qui id nomen, ante ignotum, in tractatu de Sacramento Altaris primus usurpavit: 'Oramus,' inquit, 'ut cibus hominum fiat cibus angelorum, scilicet ut oblatio panis et vini transubstantietur in corpus et sanguinem Christi.'

^a Gratian. de Consecrat. distinct. ii. c. xlii. Consentio sanctæ Romanæ et apostolicæ sedi, et ore et corde profiteor de sacramentis Dominicæ mensæ eandem fidem me tenere, quam Dominus et venerabilis Papa Nicolaus et hæc sancta synodus auctoritate evangelica et apostolica tenendam tradidit, mihique firmavit, scilicet panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri, &c.

exceeds truth,^b and is spoken hyperbolically." So little understanding was there of this monstrous doctrine, when first it began to make its appearance in the world.

But I shall pursue this matter no further, having sufficiently demonstrated that the ancients knew nothing of this doctrine, since they unanimously declared, "That the bread and wine continued in their own proper substance, after consecration." Whence it follows, that they could not adore the eucharist with Divine adoration, which they did not believe to be any otherwise than typically and symbolically the body of Christ. Indeed they did not so much as elevate it upon any account for many ages, much less for adoration. Some pretend to cite St. Basil's authority for lifting it up to shew it to the people, in order to adoration. So Schelstrate^c and Bona,^d after Bellarmin. But his words will bear no such sense: for he neither speaks of 'adoration,' nor yet of 'elevation,' to shew it to the people, but only of 'consecration,' as the Greek word ἀνάδειξις properly signifies, both in foreign and ecclesiastical writers, as Mr. Albertin^e

^b Citante Chamiero de Euchar. lib. xi. c. ii. sect. ix. p. 290. Nisi sane intelligis verba Berengarii, in majorem incidēs hæresin, quam ipse habuit.

^c Schelstrat. de Conc. Antioch. p. 219. Latini post consecrationem elevant corpus et calicem sanguinis Dominici. . . . Græci paulo post elevationem frangunt in quatuor partes sacrosanctam hostiam, et elevationem ipsam non in medio sacrificii, sed paulo ante communionem peragunt. . . . D. Basilus, libro de Spiritu Sancto, c. xxvii. 'Invocationis verba, quum ostenditur panis eucharistiæ et poculum benedictionis, quis sanctorum scripto nobis reliquit?'

^d Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xiii. sect. ii. Latini peracta consecratione, Græci paulo ante communionem . . . corpus Dominicum et calicem elevant, ut a populo adoretur. . . . — Basil. lib. de Spirit. Sanct. c. xxvii. 'Invocationis verba,' &c. — Bellarmin. de Eucharist. lib. ii. c. xv. Alterum testimonium Basilii est, in lib. de Spiritu Sancto, c. xxvii. ubi sic ait, 'Verba invocationis, quum ostenditur panis eucharistiæ, quis sanctorum in scripto nobis reliquit?' Hinc enim habemus, morem fuisse in ecclesia veteri, ut post consecrationem ostenderetur populo eucharistia, (quod etiam nunc fieri videmus) et conceptis verbis invocaretur; quæ verba quidam suspicantur fuisse, 'Kyrie, eleison.' Sed certe ex invocatione manifesta colligitur veritas Christi in eucharistia, neque enim panem invocare possumus, quantumlibet significet vel representet corpus Christi.

^e Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. ii. p. 446. Verbum ἀναδίκνυσθαι sæpe sumi apud Græcos pro designatione et consecratione ad munus aliquod, innumeris testimoniis demonstrari potest. Sic enim ex scriptoribus exoticis Strabo (lib. iv.) ait, 'Lugduni templum fuisse consecratum, ἀναδίκνυσθαι, Cæsari, communi Gallorum consilio.' Sic e sacris B. Lucas (c. x. 1), 'Post hæc Dominus, ἀνιδουξεν, de-

proves by various example. St. Basil's words are these, 'Τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναδείξεως τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας τίς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγγράφως ἡμῶν καταλείλοιπεν; Which Bellarmin, following a corrupt Latin translation, renders thus: 'Which of the saints has left us in writing the words in which the people invoke the eucharist, when it is shewed to them?' whereas they ought to be rendered thus: 'Which of the saints has left us in writing the words of the invocation or prayer, wherewith the eucharist is consecrated?' And so Perron himself, with more than ordinary ingenuity, confesses, telling us,^s "That St. Basil's words are not to be understood of the people's praying to the eucharist, but of the minister's praying to God, in a solemn form of invoca-

signavit et alios septuaginta.' Et Nyssenus (de Vita Macrini) de Basilio ipso, 'Tum Basilius, ἀνδρίχθη, ordinatus est episcopus Cæsareæ.' Et rursum (Orat. iii. in Christi Resurrect.), 'Deus hominem ejus, quæ sub cælo est, creaturæ regem ordinavit, ἀνδρίζεν.' Et Synesius (ep. lxvi.) de quodam Alexandro loquens, 'Ἀνδρίχθη, 'consecratus est seu constitutus episcopus in Bithynia per Joannem.' Et Dionysius Areopagites vulgo dictus (Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii.), 'Sacerdotes laudibus concelebrant beneficium illum principem, per quem nobis sanctificata et conservata sunt, ἀνδρίχθησαν, salutaria mysteria.' Et Proclus, in Fragmento Liturgiæ illi tributo, de apostolis loquens, ac de iis, qui eis successerunt, 'Expectabant,' inquit, 'adventum Spiritus Sancti, ut Divina sua præsentia, ἀποφῆνι τε καὶ ἀναδίζῃ, efficeret et consecraret panem ad sacrificium propositum, et calicem aqua mixtum, ipsum corpus ac sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi.' Et Liturgia Præsanctificatorum in oratione pro iis, qui ad baptismum parabantur (Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. Gr.-Lat.), 'Accipiens panem in sanctas, immaculatas, inculpabiles et immortales manus suas Dominus, ac tibi Deo Patri consecrans, ἀναδίζας, eucharistias et sanctificans, et frangens dedit nobis.' Denique ipsamet Basilii Liturgia, 'Rogamus te, &c. ut veniat Spiritus Sanctus tuus super nos et super hæc dona, eaque benedicat, sanctificet, et consecret,' ἀναδίζαι.

^f Basil. de Spirit. Sanct. c. xxvii.

^s Perron. de Eucharist. lib. ii. auctor. xv. c. iii. ap. Albertin. l. c. Pro nobis respondet (Bellarmino) Perronius, 'In textu Græco non haberi verba invocationis, quum ostenditur panis eucharistiæ, sed verba invocationis quum consecratur panis eucharistiæ. Non enim ibi agitur de invocatione adstantium, sed de ea, in qua Christi verba insita esse Basilius ipse docet, subjungens; Nec enim his contenti sumus, quæ aut apostolus aut evangelium commemorat; sed alia ante et post dicimus, ea ex doctrina non scripta mutuantes, magnam ad mysterium virtutem habentia. At verba Christi non dicuntur in adstantium precibus, sed in oratione sacerdotis;' quam veteres, et speciatim Irenæus duobus in locis, *ἐπίκλησις* appellant, perinde ac Basilius. Hæc autem oratio non funditur, quum ostenditur eucharistia, sed ante, et præcipue juxta usum liturgiarum Græcarum, &c. Itaque vocabulum Græcum, ἀνάδίζεις, consecrationem ibi significat, non ostensionem.

tion, to consecrate the eucharist:" which, as I have shewed before,^h was not done barely by pronouncing those words, "This is my body," as now it is in the Roman Church; but by a formal invocation and thanksgiving, beseeching God to sanctify the gifts; which form, St. Basil rightly says, was not by any of the evangelists left in writing. Some, again, urge the testimony of Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, as one who speaks of elevating the host after consecration. And indeed he does so: but then he gives another reason for it, and not that of the people's adoration. He says,ⁱ "It was to represent our Saviour's elevation upon the cross, and his dying there, together with his rising from the dead." Which was far from the modern intent of elevation. This author lived about the year 715; and he is the first that mentions this elevation among the Greeks, without any notice of adoration. And for the Latin Church, there is a perfect silence in all the older ritualists about it till the eleventh century, when it is mentioned by Ivo,^j Carnotensis, and Hugo De Sancto Victore,^k [or, Hugh de St. Victor,] though, still, for the same reason, given by Germanus, and not for adoration. The first writer that assigns the reason of it to be for adoration, as Mr. Daillé proves at large,^l is Gulielmus Durandus, who wrote his *Rationale*, about the year 1386.^m So that transubstantiation and adoration of the eucharist, as mother and

^h Book xv. chap. iii. sect. xi.

ⁱ German. *Theoria Rer. Divinar.* Bibl. Patr. Gr.-Lat. tom. ii. p. 163, (tom. xiii. p. 61, b. edit. Lugd. 1677.) *Elevatio in altum venerandi corporis repressat crucis elationem, et mortem in ea, et ipsam resurrectionem.*

^j Ivo, *Epist. de Sacram. Missa* (apud Dallæum de *Cult. Religios.* lib. ii. p. 237.) *Cum vero panis et calix adhibito diacono elevatio corporis Christi in cruce commemoratur.*

^k Hugo de S. Vict. de *Missa Observat.* (cit. eodem *ibid.*) *Post signa crucis sacerdos utraque manu elevat sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi, et paullo post deponit; quod significat elevationem corporis Jesu Christi in cruce, et ejusdem in sepulchrum depositionem.*

^l Dall. de *Objecto Cultus*, lib. ii. c. v. p. 277. *Sequentis demum sæculi, id est, decimi tertii, anno circiter octuagesimo Gulielmus Durandus, aliis quibusdam allatis elevationis istius rationibus, hanc postremo præter superiorum liturgiæ interpretum doctrinam addit, 'Quinto hostia,' &c. See following note.*

^m Durand. *Rational.* lib. iv. de vi. parte canon. *Quinto hostia elevatur, ut populus non præveniens consecrationem, sed ex hoc cognoscens illam factam, et Christum super altare venisse, reverenter ad terram prosternatur.*

daughter, came within an age of one another. The most learned now, in the Roman Church, confess the main of this. Bona says very frankly,^a "He cannot trace the original of elevating the sacrament immediately after consecration, in the Latin Church, higher than Ivo, and Gulielmus Parisiensis, and Hildebert of Tours, who make mention of ringing a bell at this elevation, in the twelfth and thirteenth century, when they lived:" but he owns the old *Sacramentaria*, whether printed or manuscript; and the old ritualists, Alcuin, Amalarius, Walafridus Strabo, Micrologus, and the rest, have not a syllable about it. And whereas Stephen Durantus^o boasts of its antiquity, and says it begun with the very infancy of the Church; he corrects his mistake, as relying only upon the Greek writers, who prove nothing of the customs of the Latin Church. So that here we have a plain acknowledgment of its novelty: and Daillé^p takes the same confession under the hand of Morinus^q and Goar,^r two other

^a Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xiii. sect. ii. Nec liquet, quæ prima origo fuerit in ecclesia Latina elevandi sacra mysteria, statim ac consecrata sunt: in antiquis enim sacramentorum libris et in codicibus Ordinis Romani tam excusis quam MSS. nec in priscis rituum expositoribus Alcuino, Amalario, Walfrido, Micrologo, et aliis aliquod ejus vestigium reperitur. Ea duntaxat in Ordine Romano elevatio commemoratur, qua calix attollitur ante Orationem Dominicam, Quum dixerit, 'Per quem hæc omnia, Domine,' erigit se archidiaconus solus, et quum dixerit 'per ipsum et cum ipso,' levat cum offertorio calicem per ansas, et tenet exaltans illum juxta pontificem.

^o Durant. de Ritib. Eccles. lib. ii. c. xl. sect. ii. Plane ab ipsis ecclesiæ incunabulis, post consecrationem, eucharistiam in altum tollere et populo ostendere consuetum, probat a parte Sanctus Dionysius, lib. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. Pontifex, &c. Vid. Bon. ibid.

^p Dall. l. c. p. 237. Goar, vir eruditissimus et Latinarum traditionum studiosissimus, vere meritoque negat plane constare, quando consecrationi apud Latinos juncta fuerit hostiæ elevatio; et Stephani Duranti, numquam ab ea divisam fuisse contenditis, opinionem jure adspernatur. Hoc quidem ex eo, quod ego proxime observavi, auctorum tam multorum de illa silentio constat, non fuisse hunc ritum apud Latinos receptum ante undecimum sæculum; quo eos vixisse, quos ad hanc rem Goar citavit, et Micrologi auctorem, omnes fatentur, et ipsum Ordinis Romani scriptorem, si alii negant, docuit ac probavit Joannes Morinus.

^q Morin. de Ordin. part. iii. exercit. viii. c. i.

^r Goar. Not. in Eucholog. p. 146, sect. clviii. Quando consecrationi apud Latinos juncta fuerit hostiæ elevatio, non plane constat. — Steph. Durantus ab ea numquam fuisse divisam contendit, sed infirmo juxta suam sententiam Dionysii et Maximi fundamento, qui scriptis suis, non nisi Græcis ritibus, suffragantur.

learned writers of the Roman Church, as Bishop Stillingfleet* does also from Menardus.

SECT. V.—*No Adoration of the Host before the Twelfth or Thirteenth Century.*

But it may be said, though there was no elevation of the host, nor ringing of a bell, before this time, in the Latin Church, yet there might be Divine adoration, for all that, paid to the eucharist from the beginning. Cardinal Perron was so confident of this, that he makes sitting a posture of devotion, on purpose to prove that the apostles adored it sitting. The vanity of which pretence has been shewed before. A great many other proofs are alleged out of the ancients to prove this adoration. But they prove no more, but either that a veneration was paid to the sacrament, as to the books of the Gospel, and the water of baptism, and the Lord's table, and many other sacred things, which no one denies; or else, that the adoration was given to Christ, as divinely present every where, or as sitting at the right hand of God in heaven, whither they were directed by the admonition of *Sursum corda*, to 'lift up their hearts,' and to elevate their own souls, to adore him there. St. Jerom speaks of common and ordinary veneration, when he says,† "Men were taught by the Scriptures, with what veneration they ought to receive holy things, and serve in the ministry of Christ's altar, and not so esteem the holy cups, and holy veils, and other things pertaining to the service of the Lord's passion, to be without holiness, as inanimate things, and void of sense, but as things, which, for their relation to the body and blood of the Lord, were to be venerated with the

* Stillingfleet, Orig. Brit. p. 236, ex Menardo, Not. in Gregor. Sacram. p. 374. It is well observed by Cardinal Bona, that the custom of elevation of the host, in order to adoration, is found in none of the ancient sacramentaries. . . . The same had been ingenuously confessed before by Menardus, in the same words.

† Hieron. Epist. ad Theophilum. Discant qui ignorant, eruditi testimoniis Scripturarum, qua debeant veneratione sancta suscipere, et altaris Christi ministerio deservire; sacrosque calices, et sancta velamina, et cætera, quæ ad cultum pertinent Dominicæ passionis, non quasi inania, et sensu carentia sanctimoniam non habere; sed ex consortio corporis et sanguinis Domini, eadem qua corpus ejus et sanguis, majestate veneranda. (Venet. 1766, vol. i. p. 759, b.)

same majesty and reverence as his body and blood. Such reverence as this, which was given to the cups and other utensils of the altar, no doubt was given to the sacrament, as the symbolical body and blood of Christ : but this could not be a veneration of Divine worship and adoration, unless we can think that they gave Divine worship to the cups and utensils of the altar, which, he says, were venerated with the same respect as the body and blood of Christ. Mr. Albertin^u gives a great many instances of this kind of veneration paid to churches, and the book of the law, and baptism, which can signify no more than their reverent use of them as sacred and venerable things. And such a veneration they paid to the sacrament; never putting consecrated bread to any profane or common use; much less violating its sacredness by any more indecent practice, as was that outrage of the Donatists, when they threw it to the dogs; never touching it with unwashen hands; being extremely cautious not to let any particle of it fall to the ground: which is a particular caution, noted by many of the ancients, Tertullian,^w St. Austin,^x Cyril of Jerusalem,^y and Origen,^z who styles it a

^u Albertin. de Eucharist. p. 432, §. Tertium est, &c. toto.

^w Tertul. de Coron. Milit. c. iii. p. 102. Calicis, aut panis etiam nostri, aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur.

^x Aug. Hom. xxvi. et l. Quanta sollicitudine observamus, quando nobis corpus Christi ministratur, ut nihil ex ipso de nostris manibus in terram cadat, tanta sollicitudine observemus, ne verbum Dei, quod nobis erogatur, dum aliquid aut cogitamus aut loquimur, de corde nostro pereat.

^y Cyril. Hierosolym. Catech. Mystag. v. sect. xviii. Προσιὼν οὖν, μὴ τιταμίνοις τοῖς τῶν χειρῶν καρποῖς προσέρχου, μηδὲ διηρημένοις τοῖς δακτύλοις· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀριστιερὰν θρόνον ποιήσας τῇ διέξῃ, ὡς μελλούσῃ βασιλείᾳ ὑποδέχισθαι καὶ κοιλάνας τὴν παλάμην, δίχου τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐπιλίγων τὸ, Ἀμήν· μὴτ' ἀσφαλείας οὖν ἀγιάσας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῇ ἐπαφῇ τοῦ ἁγίου Σώματος, μεταλάμβανε, προσέχων μὴ παραπολίσης τι ἐκ τούτου αὐτοῦ ὅπερ γὰρ ἰὰν ἀπολίσης, τούτῃ ὡς ἀπὸ εἰκίου δηλονότι ἐξημαόθης μίλους· εἰπὶ γὰρ μοι, εἴ τις σοι ἴδωκε ψήγματα χρυσοῦ, οὐκ ἂν μετὰ πάσης ἀσφαλείας ἐκράτεις, φυλαττόμενος μὴ τι αὐτῶν παραπολίσης, καὶ ζημίαν ὑποστῇς; οὐ πολλὰ οὖν μᾶλλον ἀσφαλίστερον, τοῦ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθων τιμίων τιμωτιέρου διασκοπήσεις, ὅπερ τοῦ μὴ ψίχαν σοι ἐκπισαῖν. Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ κοινωνῆσαί τι τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ, προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ αἵματος, μὴ ἀνατίνων τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλὰ κύπτων, καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σιδᾶσματος λίγων τὸ, Ἀμήν, ἀγιάζου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνων Χριστοῦ. ἴτι δὲ τῆς νοτίδος ἰνούσης τοῖς χεῖλεσί σου χερσὶν ἐπαφώμενος, καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ μίτωπον, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγιάζει αἰσθητήρια· εἶτα ἀναμείνας τὴν εὐχὴν, εὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ τῷ καταξιώσαντί σε τῶν τηλικούτων μυστηρίων. (Paris. 1609, p. 545.)

^z Origen. Hom. xiii. in Exod. Nostis, qui Divinis mysteriis interesse con-

reverence in express terms. Whence Bellarmin very wisely concludes, they must needs believe it to be Christ's natural body, and adore it. As if holy things could not be used with such caution and reverence, but presently it must be interpreted an act of adoration.

But the ancients sometimes say, they worshipped Christ in the eucharist. Which we do not deny neither. St. Austin says,^a "No man eats the flesh of Christ, but he that first worships it." And there are like expressions in Ambrose, Chrysostom, and some other ancient writers. But then they sufficiently explain their own meaning, giving us to understand, that they neither speak of oral manducation, nor of adoring Christ as corporeally present in the eucharist, but as spiritually present, or else as corporeally absent in heaven. St. Chrysostom says,^b "They fell down before Christ their King as captives in baptism, and that they cast themselves down upon their knees before him." And yet no one would conclude, therefore, that they worshipped him as corporeally present in baptism, although baptism made them partakers of his body and blood also. He says further,^c "That the king himself bowed his body, because of God speaking in the holy Gospels." But it would be ridiculous hence to infer, either that they worshipped the Gospels, or Christ as corporeally present in them. Mr. Albertin^d has demonstrated, out of St. Austin's works, these several propositions, which are all point blank contrary to the adoration of Christ, as corporeally present in the eucharist. 1. That bread and

suevistis, quomodo, quum suscipitis corpus Domini, cum omni cautela et veneratione servatis, ne ex eo parum quid decadat, ne consecrati muneris aliquid delabatur. Reos enim vos creditis et recte creditis, si quid inde per negligentiam decadat. Quod si circa corpus ejus conservandum tanta utimini cautela, et merito utimini; quomodo putatis esse minoris piaculi, verbum Dei neglexisse quam corpus ejus?

^a Aug. in Psalm. xcvi. (tom. viii. opp. p. 1104, edit. Basil. 1569.)

^b Chrysostom. in illud, Simile est regnum cœlorum, &c. Ἐπειδὴν καταλάβητι τὸν νομφῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος, ἐπειδὴν εἰσδράμῃσι τὴν πασάδα τῆς χάριτος, ἐπειδὴν πλησίον γίνῃσθι τῆς φοβερᾶς ὁμοῦ καὶ ποθεινῆς κολυμβήσεως, ὡς αἰχμάλωτοι προσπίσῃσι τῷ βασιλεῖ, ῥίψασι πάντες ὁμοίως ἐπὶ γόνατα.

^c Ibid. in illud, Attendite, ne eleemosynam faciatis, ap. Albertin. p. 432. Ἐπορεύεσθαι διὰ τὸν ἐν ταῖς ἀγίοις εὐαγγελίοις ὁμιλοῦντα Θεόν.

^d Albertin. de Sacram. Eucharist. p. 602, &c.

wine are not properly and substantially the body and blood of Christ, but only sacramentally and figuratively. 2. That Christ is not substantially and corporally present in the eucharist, but corporally present only in heaven. 3. That true bread remains and is eaten in the eucharist. 4. That the manducation of Christ, in the eucharist, is not oral, but spiritual. 5. That the wicked do not eat or drink the proper body and blood of Christ in the eucharist. 6. That the same body cannot be in different places at one and the same time; and that this is particularly asserted of the body of Christ. 7. That a body must necessarily occupy some place and space, and be extended by parts, with longitude, latitude, and profundity. 8. That accidents cannot subsist without a subject. All which directly overthrow the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist, and consequently shew, that the adoration which was given to Christ in the eucharist, was not to his corporal presence, but his spiritual presence, or to his body, as absent in heaven.

But Durantus^e undertakes to prove, that the body of Christ was not only worshipped as corporally present in the eucharist, in the use and time of celebration, but at other times by non-communicants also. For this he alleges Chrysostom,^f who says, “That the energumens, at that time, were brought by the deacon, and made to bow their heads.” Which Durantus interprets of bowing to the eucharist. But Chrysostom unluckily spoils his argument. For at that time, he says, the eucharist was not consecrated, but only about to be consecrated; and these energumens were not

^e Durant. de Ritibus, lib. ii. c. xl. sect. v. Adoratam fuisse eucharistiam extra usum et a non communicantibus, probat S. Chrysostomus, Hom. iii. de incomprehensibili Dei natura. Ibi enim loquens de energumenis ait, ‘Agitatos quoque, ob eam rem, diaconus tempore illo ducit, et jubet caput inclinare.’ Et Hom. iv. ejusdem tractationis. Cur homines dæmone agitados, et furore accitos teterrimo, adduci tempore illo, et capita inclinare, jubet diaconus.

^f Chrysostom. Hom. iii. de Incomprehensibili Dei Natura, p. 365, (tom. i. p. 324, edit. Francof.) Καὶ τοὺς ενεργουμένους κατ’ ἐκείνον ἴσθησι τὸν καιρὸν ὁ διάκονος, καὶ κλιύει κλίνειν τὴν κεφαλὴν μόνον, καὶ τῇ σχήματι ποιῆσαι τοῦ σώματος τὰς ἐκτενήσεις. — Id. Hom. iv. ibid. p. 374, (p. 332, edit. cit.) Ἔσται δὲ ἡ χάρις, ἃν διδάξωμεν ὑμᾶς, τίνος ἕνεκεν ἐκείνη γίνεται πρὸς τῶν ἄλλων ἡ εὐχὴ, καὶ τί δέησι, τοὺς δαιμονῶντας καὶ τῇ μανίᾳ ποιητῶν κατισταμένους εἰσαγίσεσθαι κλιύει τότε ὁ διάκονος καὶ κλίνειν τὰς κεφαλὰς.

allowed to stay to hear the prayers of consecration with the faithful, but were dismissed with the catechumens, and other non-communicants, before the communion-service began. So that if they worshipped the host, it must be an unconsecrated host; which, according to Durantus himself, would be plain idolatry. So unfortunate are these gentlemen in the best arguments they can produce for host-worship among the ancients, that their own very proofs manifestly overthrow it.

On the other hand, there are most certain demonstrations, that there could be no such thing as host-worship in the ancient Church, not only taken from their not believing transubstantiation and the corporal presence, but from many other topics solidly deduced and substantially proved by two learned writers, Mr. Daillé^s and Dr. Whitby,^b in two excellent discourses upon this very subject, to which I will commend the reader, contenting myself to mention the heads of the principal arguments, which they have more fully drawn out and proved. Mr. Daillé ranks his arguments under two heads: some general ones against the worship of the eucharist, saints, relics, images, and crosses; and others more particularly levelled against the worship of the eucharist. Among those of the first kind, he urges this as very remarkable, that in all the ancient relations of miracles, there is never any mention made of miracles being wrought by the eucharist, as is now so common in later ages, especially in the book called the School of the Eucharist, which is a collection of legends, under the name of miracles, wrought by the host upon sundry occasions. 2. He urges another general argument from the silence of all such writers of the Church as speak of traditions, that the worship of the eucharist is never once named among them. 3. That among the heathen objections and calumnies which they raised against them, such as their worshipping the sun and an ass's head, and the genitals of their priests, and a crucified and dead man, they never objected to them the worship of bread and wine; which yet had been very obvious and natural, and

^s Dall. de Objecto Cultus Religiosi, contr. Latin. lib. i. and ii.

^b Whitby, Idolatry of Host-Worship, Lond. 1679, 8vo.

invidious enough to have accused them of, had there then been any such plausible ground for an accusation, as there has been in later ages. 4. The Christians used to object to the heathens, that they worshipped things that were dumb and void of life; things that must be carried upon men's shoulders, and, if they fell, could not rise again; things that must be guarded by men to secure them from thieves; things that might be carried captive, and were not able to preserve and deliver themselves; things that might be laid to pawn, as the eucharist has been by some princes in later ages; things that are exposed to fire, and weather, and rust, and moth, and corruption, and other injuries of nature; things that might be devoured by mice and other animals, and might be gnawed and dinged upon by the most contemptible creatures. All which objections might easily have been retorted by the heathen upon the Christians, had they then worshipped the eucharist, or images, or relics, or crosses, which are liable to all the same reproaches. These are general arguments against host-worship, together with the rest of that idolatrous worship which now so abounds in the Church of Rome. But there are a great many more special arguments urged, in particular, against the host-worship, by that learned man. As first, from the silence of all ancient writers about it. 2. From their using no elevation of the host for worship for many ages, as we have shewed at large out of Bona before. 3. The ancients knew nothing of ringing a bell to give notice of the time of adoration to the people. 4. There are no histories of beasts miraculously worshipping the eucharist, which sort of fictions are so common in later ages. 5. The ancients never carried the eucharist to the sick or absent, with any pomp or signs of worship; never exposed it to public view in times of solemn rejoicing or sorrow; never adored or invoked its assistance in distress, or upon any great undertaking; which are now such common practices in the Roman Church. 6. The ancients never enjoined persons newly baptized, and penitents, to fall down before the eucharist, and worship it, as is now commonly done in the Roman Church. 7. The ancients never allowed non-communicants to stay and wor-

ship the eucharist, as the practice now is; which yet had been very proper, had they believed the eucharist to be their God; but they used it only for communion, not for adoration. 8. The ancients never used to carry the eucharist publicly in processions, to be adored by all the people; which is a novel practice in the judgment of Krantzius¹ and Cassander.² 9. The ancients lighted no lamps nor candles by day to the eucharist, nor burned incense before it, as is now the practice. 10. They made no little images of the eucharist, to be kissed and worshipped as the images of Christ. 11. They had no peculiar festival appropriated to its more solemn worship. This is of no longer date than Pope Urban IV., who first instituted it (an. 1264), and it is peculiar only to the Roman Church. 12. The ancient liturgies have no forms of prayers, doxologies, or praises to the eucharist, as are in the Roman Missal. 13. The adoration of the eucharist was never objected by the heathens to the primitive Christians; nor were they reproached, as the Romanists have been since, as eaters of their God. It is a noted saying of Averroes, *Quando quidem comedunt Christiani quod colunt, sit anima mea cum philosophis*, ‘Since Christians eat what they worship, let my soul rather have her portion among the philosophers.’ This learned philosopher lived about the year 1150, when the host-worship began to be practised, which gave him this prejudice to the Christian

¹ Krantz. Metrop. lib. xi. c. xxxix. Fertur idem inter alia salubria constituisse de venerabili eucharistia, cujus erat tunc (ut nunc) quidam abusus, quum in publicum deferretur in diebus Jovis per anni circulum. Res, ut prima fronte prætenditur, devotioni parata; sed ut evidenter claruit, per crebram ejus ostentationem vilescente, quæ semper ardens et summa debuit esse, reverentia. Constituit ergo, ut non in publicum efferretur, nisi infra octavam festivitatis, institutæ ad honorem sanctissimæ eucharistiæ: præsertim quia ejus usus a cœlesti magistro institutus est ad esum, non ostentationem.

² Cassander. Consultat. Sect. de Circumgestat. Consuetudo, qua panis eucharistiæ in publica pompa conspicuus circumfertur, ac passim omnium hominum oculis ingeritur, præter veterum morem et mentem, haud ita longo tempore inducta et recepta videtur. Illi enim hoc mysterium in tanta religione ac veneratione habuerunt, ut non modo ad ejus perceptionem, sed ne inspectionem quidem admitterent, nisi fideles, quos Christi membra et tanti mysterii participatione dignos esse existimarent. Quare ante consecrationem, catechumeni, energumeni, penitentes, denique non communicantes, diaconi voce et ostiariorum ministerio secludebantur.

religion. 14. The Christians objected such things to the heathens, as they never would have objected, had they themselves worshipped the host; as that it was an impious thing to eat what they worshipped, and worship what they ate and sacrificed: which objections might easily have been retorted upon them. 15. The Christians were accused by the heathens of eating infants' blood in their solemn mysteries; but never any mention is made of eating the blood of Christ, either in the objection, or answer to it. The ground of the story arose from the practice of the Carpocratians, and other heretics, and not from the Christians eating the blood of Christ. 16. Lastly, the Christians never urged the adoration of the eucharist in their disputes with the Ebionites and Docetæ, which yet would have been very proper to confute their errors, who denied the reality of the flesh of Christ. To these arguments of Mr. Daillé, Dr. Whitby has added these further: 1. That the Scriptures and fathers deride the heathen deities, and say, that we may know they are no gods, because they have no use of their outward senses. 2. Because they are made gods by consecration, and by the will of the artificer, part of that matter which is consecrated into a god, being exposed to common uses. 3. Because they were imprisoned in their images, or shut up in obscure habitations. 4. Because they clothed their gods in costly raiments. 5. Because they might be metamorphosed or changed from one shape to another. All which might have been retorted upon the Christians, had they worshipped the eucharist, without any possibility of evasion. Soto and Paludanus own, that the whole eucharist, substance as well as species, may be vomited up again, or voided at the draught; which to affirm of the real body of Christ, the ancients would have accounted the greatest blasphemy. For these and the like reasons we may safely conclude, that there was no such practice among the ancients as giving Divine honour to the host, upon presumption of its being the real body of Christ, though they treated it as the sacred symbol and antitype of his body with all imaginable respect and veneration. To deduce these arguments at their full length would fill a volume, and, therefore, it is sufficient

here to have hinted the heads of them in this summary account, referring the reader to those two learned authors, who have proved every thing they say, for fuller satisfaction. I now go on with the practice of the ancient Church.

SECT. VI.—*The People allowed to receive the Eucharist into their own Hands.*

In distributing the elements the people were allowed to receive them into their own hands; which now, since the belief of transubstantiation and the adoration of the host came in, is severely prohibited in the Roman Church. And this is, at least, another strong presumption, that the ancients had very different sentiments of the eucharist from those which now prevail in the Roman Church. As to fact, there is no dispute of the matter. The thing is confest by Baronius,^k and Morinus,^l and Garsias Loaisa,^m as Dailléⁿ has noted out of them. And Bona^o confesses he cannot tell when the contrary custom first came in; but he thinks it very probable, that it began at the same time that they first brought into the Western Church the use of unleavened bread and wafer hosts; which, as he proves before, was not till the twelfth or thirteenth century. But that the reader may not wholly depend upon these concessions, I will note a few places out of Tertullian,^p Clemens Alexandrinus,^q

^k Baron. an. 57, n. cxlvii. (n. cxlix. edit. Antwerp. 1670.) Dabat sacerdos in manus cujusque eucharistiam, quam sic ille cum summa reverentia ori admovebat. Suppetunt de ea re quam plurima testimonia sanctorum patrum, &c.

^l Morin. de Ordinat. part. iii. exercit. xii. c. iii. tot.

^m Loaisa in Conc. Tolet. I. c. xiv. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 1239.) Antiquus ecclesiæ mos fuit, dare fidelibus eucharistiam in manus.

ⁿ Dall. de Objecto Cult. Relig. lib. ii. c. xx. (p. 299, edit. Genev. 2664.)

^o Bon. Rer. Liturgic. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. vii. — Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vii. c. ix. Fideles, qui corpus Domini manu acceptura erant, lotis prius studiose manibus accedebant.

^p Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. iii. p. 102. Eucharistiæ sacramentum . . . nec de aliorum manu quam præidentium sumimus. — Id. de Idololatr. c. vii. p. 88, D. Eas manus admoveere corpori Domini, quæ dæmoniis corpora conferunt.

^q Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 318. Τινὲς εὐχαριστίαν διανίμαντες, ὡς ἱθὺς, αὐτὸν δὴ ἱκανστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μῆραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν. ἀρίστη γὰρ πρὸς τὴν ἀκριβοῦς αἵρεσιν τε καὶ φυγὴν ἡ συνήθεια.

Cyprian,^r Origen,^s Dionysius Alexandrinus,^t Cyril of Jerusalem,^u Nazianzen,^v Basil,^w Ambrose,^x Austin,^y Chrysostom,^z and the Councils of Trullo;^a which I think it needless to repeat at length, in a matter so plain and uncontested. The very custom of washing the hands before communion, in order to receive it; the frequent admonitions to beware of letting it fall; the allowance of private men to carry it home with them, and communicate in private; the sending it to the sick sometimes by private men, which we

^r Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 131, (p. 93, fin. edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Jacens stantibus, et integris vulneratus minatur; et quod non statim Domini corpus inquinatis manibus accipiat, aut ore polluto Domini sanguinem bibat, sacerdotibus sacrilegus irascitur. — Id. de Patient. p. 216, (p. 149, edit. Amstelod.) Sit fortis et stabilis in corde patientia: et nec adulterio sanctificatum corpus et Dei templum polluitur, &c.; nec post gestatam eucharistiam, manus gladio et cruore maculatur. — Id. Epist. lvi. al. lviii. ad Thibaritanos, p. 125, (p. 258, edit. Amstelod.) Armemus dextram gladio spirituali, ut sacrificia funesta fortiter respuat, et eucharistiæ memor, quæ Domini corpus accepit, ipsum complectatur, postea a Domino, sumtura præmium cælestium coronarum.

^s Orig. Hom. xliii. in Exod. Nostis, &c. Vid. sect. v. sub not. (*), p. 247.

^t Dionys. Alexandr. Epist. ad Xyst. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. ix. Vid. supra sect. iii. sub litt. (*), p. 224.

^u Cyril. Catech. Mystagog. v. sect. xviii. Vid. sect. v. sub litt. (†), p. 247.

^v Nazianz. de Ornatu Mulier. tom. ii. p. 152.

Οὐδὲ χεῖρες φρίσσουσιν, ἰπὴν ἐς μύστιν ἰδωδὴν

Τίτῃσι, αἷς σὺ γράφεις πίνθμον ἀγλαῖν;

^w Basil. Epist. cclxxix. ad Cæsaream Patriciam. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἠποιδίδωσι τὴν μερίδα, καὶ κατὰ χεῖρα αὐτὴν ὁ ὑποδισχόμενος μιστ' ἱερωσύνης ἀπάσης, καὶ οὕτω προσάγει τῷ στόματι τῇ ἰδίᾳ χερεῖ.

^x Ambros. Orat. ad Theodos. ap. Theodoret. lib. v. c. xviii. Πῶς δὲ τοιαύταις ὑποδείξῃ χερεῖ τοῦ Δισπότου τὸ πανάγιον σῶμα; πῶς δὲ τῷ στόματι προσέοις τὸ αἶμα τὸ τίμιον;

^y Aug. Cont. litt. Petil. lib. ii. c. xxiii. (tom. vii. opp. p. 102, edit. Basil. 1569.) In cujus manibus eucharistiam ponebatis. — Id. Hom. xxvi. ex l. Vid. sect. v. sub litt. (*), p. 247.

^z Chrysostom. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. i. p. 266, (p. 236, edit. Francof.) 'Ενόςσον, τί δίχῃ τῇ χερεῖ. — Hom. xxii. p. 286, (p. 253, edit. cit.) 'Εχθρὸν ἔχεις; μὴ προσέλθῃς βούλῃ προσελθῆναι, καὶ τότε προσελθὼν ἄψαι τοῦ ἱεροῦ. — Ibid. p. 290, (p. 257, edit. cit.) Μὴ τολμᾷς ἀνίστασθαι χερεῖ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἄψασθαι θυσίας, κ. τ. λ. — Hom. xxiv. p. 316, (p. 281, edit. cit.) Μετὰ πολλῆς σιγῆς . . . τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης ἀπτάμεθα θυσίας. — Hom. vi. cont. Jud. tom. i. p. 540, (p. 477, edit. cit.) Ποῖα χερεῖ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἄψῃ τραπίζης; — Hom. iii. in Ephes. (p. 888, edit. cit.) Εἰπὶ μοι, ἄρα ἂν ἔλω χερεῖς ἀνίστασθαι τῇ θυσίᾳ προσελθῆναι; οὐκ ἔγωγε οἶμαι . . . εἴτα ἐν τῷ μικρῷ οὗτος ὂν εὐλαβῆς, ψυχὴν ἔχων ῥυπαρὰν προσέρχῃ, καὶ ἄπτισθαι τολμᾷς. — Hom. vi. in Seraphim, et passim.

^a Conc. Trul. c. ci. Vid. sect. vii. seq. sub litt. (†), p. 260.

have spoken of before, do all bear testimony to the same practice. But all these customs are perfectly antiquated and abolished in the Roman Church, since the practice of host-worship came in, partly by forbidding the people to touch the bread with their own hands, but suffer it to be dropt into their mouths, and partly by withdrawing the cup wholly from them. Many wise and pretty reasons are used to be given for abolishing this ancient custom, as that it is to prevent men's negligence and irreverence, and other abuses. But the fathers had much better reasons for allowing it: for then it afforded them a noble argument to keep innocent and holy hands free from idolatry, murder, rapine, and extortion, and other the like vices, when they must with those very hands receive the immaculate body and blood of their Lord. "A man might declaim," says Tertullian,^b "all the day long, with the zeal of faith, and bewail those Christians who work with their hands at the trade of making idols for the heathen gods, and come immediately from the shop of the adversary to the house of God, to lift up those hands to God the Father, which are the makers or mothers of idols, and stretch forth those hands to receive the body of the Lord, that were instrumental in carving bodies for devils." With what eloquence does St. Chrysostom inveigh against rapine and bloodshed, and strife and contention, upon this very topic! "Consider," says he,^c "what thou takest into thy hand, and never dare to smite any man. Do not disgrace those hands, which are adorned with so great a gift, by the crime of fighting and contention. Consider

^b Tertul. de Idololatr. c. vii. (p. 88, D.) Tota die ad hanc partem zelus fidei perorabit, ingemens Christianum ab idolis in ecclesiam venire; [de adversarii officina in domum Dei], attollere ad Deum Patrem manus matres idolorum: his manibus adorare, quæ foris adversus Deum adorantur: eas manus admovere corpori Domini, quæ dæmoniis corpora conferunt.—Conf. Cyprian. Ep. lvi. al. lviii. cit. sub litt. (r), p. 255.

^c Chrysostom. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. i. p. 266, A. (p. 236, edit. Francof.) 'Ενόνησον τί δίχῃ τῇ χειρὶ, καὶ μηδέποτε ἀνάσχη τυπτῆσαι τίνα, μηδὲ τὴν τοσούτῃ τιμηθεῖσαν δώρῳ καταισχύνῃς τῇ τῆς πληγῆς ἀμαρτίᾳ· ἰνόνησον τί δίχῃ τῇ χειρὶ, καὶ καθαρὰν αὐτὴν πλιονεξίας καὶ ἀρπαγῆς πάσης διατήρησον λογίσαι, ὅτι οὐ τῇ χειρὶ δίχῃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ στόματι προσάγεις, καὶ καθαρὰν φύλαττε τὴν γλῶσσαν αἰσχυρῶν καὶ ὑβριστικῶν ῥημάτων, βλασφημίας, ἱεροεξίας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων ἀπάντων.

what thou takest into thy hands, and keep them free from all rapine and extortion. Consider that thou not only takest it in thy hands, but puttest it to thy mouth : therefore keep thy tongue pure from all filthy and contumelious words, from blasphemy, perjury, and all such kinds of evil discourse." So, again, reproving those who, in time of sickness, went to the Jews to get charms and amulets to cure their distemper, he asks them,^d "What apology they would make to Christ, for thus flying to his enemies in their distress? How they could call upon him in their prayers? With what conscience they could come into the church? With what eyes they could look upon the priest? With what hands they could touch the holy table?" And, in another place, repressing the people's fury against Eutropius (who, having procured a law to be made against men's taking sanctuary at the altar, was himself not long after, by falling under the emperor's displeasure, forced to fly thither for refuge; and, then, some of the people clamoured against him with revengeful thoughts, and cried out, "It was but just that he should suffer the effects of his own law;") to suppress the people's anger in this case, and incline them to thoughts of mercy and pardon, he asks them,^e "How otherwise they could take the sacrament into their hands, when sermon was done, and say that prayer, which commands them to beg of God, that he would 'forgive them their trespasses, as they forgave them that trespassed against them,' if they persisted to call for justice upon their enemy?" These are handsome turns of eloquence, grounded upon this innocent and pious custom of the people's taking the sacrament into their own hands; and they had often their due weight and force even upon the greatest minds, as may appear from the effect of that speech which St. Ambrose made to the Emperor Theo-

^d Chrysostom. Hom. vi. cont. Jud. tom. i. p. 539, (p. 477, edit. Francof.) Πῶς ἀπολογία τῷ Χριστῷ; πῶς αὐτὸν καλίσουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις; ποίῳ συνιδόντι λοιπὸν ἰσχύσει τῆς ἐκκλησίας; ποίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐκὼς ὅψου τὸν ἱερεῖα; ποίῳ χειρὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἁψῆς τραπέζης;

^e Ibid. Hom. in Eutrop. tom. iv. p. 554, (p. 485, edit. cit.) Πῶς δὲ, τοῦ διατάξου τούτου λυθόντος, ὑμῖς μυστηρίων ἄψισθι, καὶ σὴν ἐσχὴν ἐρεῖται ἐκείνην, δι' ἧς κελευόμεθα λίσσιν, "Ἄφες ἡμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖς ἀφίμεν τοῖς ὀφειλόμενοις ἡμῶν, τὸν ὑμῶν ὀφειλίστην ἀπαιτοῦντες δίκην;

dosius, when he had caused seven thousand men to be slaughtered, without any form of trial, at Thessalonica. St. Ambrose met him as he was entering the church, and thus accosted him :^f “ With what eyes wilt thou behold the house of our common Lord? With what feet wilt thou tread his holy pavement? Wilt thou stretch out those hands, yet dropping with the blood of that unjust slaughter; and with them lay hold of the most holy body of the Lord? Wilt thou put the cup of that blood to thy mouth, who hast shed so much blood by the hasty decree of an angry and impetuous mind?” This just reproof of the pious bishop, so handsomely addressed to the emperor, made such a deep impression on his mind, that it melted him into tears, and made him refrain from church as a penitent; till, by way of satisfaction, among other things, by St. Ambrose’s direction, he made this good law, “ That no sentence of death or proscription, for the future, should be executed till thirty days after its promulgation, that reason, and not passion, might judge of the equity and reasonableness of it.” Such brave speeches, and such worthy effects, did that ancient pious custom minister the occasion to of old, which is now laid aside in the Roman Church, and changed into another custom, that has neither precedent nor use; serving only to feed superstition, and keep men under the monstrous and inveterate prejudices of transubstantiation; which this innocent rite served, in some measure, to keep out of the minds of men in the Primitive Church.

SECT. VII.—*Whether the same Custom was observed in delivering it to Women and Children.*

It is further observable, that, in this case, no distinction was made between men, women, and children, but all received into their own hands, who were capable of so doing; only, in the latter end of the sixth century, we find a rule

^f Theodoret. lib. v. c. xviii. Vales. p. 220, C. Ποίους ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄψει τὸν κοινοῦ Δισπότου νῶν; ποίους δὲ πρὸς τὸ δάσκειν ἐκείνο πατήσης τὸ ἄγιον; πῶς δὲ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτινῆς, ἀποσταζούσας ἴτι τοῦ ἀδίκου φόνου τὸ αἷμα; πῶς δὲ τοιούταις ὑποδείξῃ τοῦ Δισπότου τὸ πανάγιον σῶμα; πῶς δὲ τῇ στόματι προσοίσεις τὸ αἷμα τὸ τίμιον, τοσεῦσεν διὰ τὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ λόγον ἐκχέας παρανόμως αἷμα;

made about women, that they should not receive it in their bare hand, but in a fair linen cloth. Some think this as ancient as St. Austin's time, because, in one of the sermons *De Tempore* that go under his name, there is mention made of it; for there it is said,^s "It was customary for men to wash their hands when they communicated, and for women to bring their little linen cloths to receive the body of Christ." But, as many of these sermons are spurious, so this, in particular, is sometimes ascribed to other authors; and therefore no weight can be laid upon it. However, the Council of Auxerre,^h in France (an. 520), made a rule, that no woman should receive the eucharist in her bare hand; but after what manner she should receive it in her hand, is not said. A great many learned persons think, that another canon in that councilⁱ orders them to receive it in a linen cloth; because there is mention made of women's wearing a *dominicale* when they communicate: which they interpret 'a linen cloth upon their hand.' So not only Baronius, and Binnius, and Sylvius, but also Bona,^k and Habertus,^l and even Mabillon,^m and Vossius,ⁿ understand it. But Baluzius, who is often more sagacious than the rest in telling the

^s Aug. Serm. cclii. de Temp. Omnes viri, quando communicare desiderant, lavant manus: et omnes mulieres exhibent linteamina, ubi corpus Christi accipiant.

^h Conc. Antissiodor. c. xxxvi. (tom. v. Conc. p. 960.) Non licet mulieri nuda manu eucharistiam accipere.

ⁱ Ibid. c. xlii. Una quæque mulier, quando communicat, dominicalem suam habeat. Quod si qua non habuerit, usque in alium diem Dominicum non communicet.

^k Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. iii. Notandum est, in susceptione eucharistiæ inter viros et mulieres discrimen aliquod fuisse: nam viri nuda manu, mulieres subjecto linteolo, quod dominicale dicebatur, illam accipiebant. Sic statutum legimus in Concilio Antissiodor. c. xxxvi. Non licet, &c. et c. xlii. Ut unaquæque mulier dominicale suum habeat, &c.

^l Habert. Archierat. part. x. observat. viii. p. 264. Linteamen illud dominicalis nomine donatum apud Gallos.

^m Mabillon. de Liturg. Gallican. lib. i. c. v. n. xxv. p. 52. Mulieres linteo Dominicali utebantur, ut notum est ex c. xlii. Conc. Antissiodor.

ⁿ Voss. Thes. Theol. de Symbolis Cænæ Domin. p. 477, (p. 292, edit. Hag. Com. 1658.) Videtur Concilium illud (Antissiodorense) velle, ut feminæ eucharistiam in mundo linteo acciperent: quod linteum esse vocatum dominicale, colligunt viri eruditi ex sequentibus (c. xlii.) verbis, 'Unaquæque mulier, quando communicat, dominicale suum habeat,' &c.

meaning of hard words, says,^o “ It means only the women’s veil, which they were obliged to wear upon their heads by ancient canons, conformable to the rule of the apostle.” And for this he quotes an ancient collection of canons, where, in the Council of Mascon, the *dominicale* is expressly styled ‘ the veil which the women wore upon their heads at the communion.’ So that whatever covering the women used for their heads, when they received the communion, it is plain it was a different thing from the *dominicale*. The Council of Trullo^p speaks of some in the Greek Church, who would not receive the sacrament in their hands, but in some little instrument of gold, or other precious material, out of a pretended reverence to it; but they condemn and forbid it, as a superstitious practice, ordering all persons to receive the communion in their own hands, set in the form of a cross, as is appointed in Cyril’s Catechisms,^q and some others before them; and for those that pretended to bring those little trinkets to receive the communion with, they order them to be rejected, as persons who preferred inanimate matter to the living image of God. And withal they threatened suspension to any priest that shall admit any communicants to receive in such manner. By which it is plain, no alteration was as yet allowed in this matter in the Greek Church.

^o Baluz. Not. in Gratian. caus. xxxiii. quæst. iii. c. xix. Si mulier communicans dominicale suum super caput suum non habuerit, usque ad illum diem Dominicum non communicet.

^p Conc. Trul. c. ci. Εἴ τις τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος μετασχὼν ἐν τῇ τῆς συνάξεως βουληθείη καιρῷ, καὶ ἱμνηροῦν αὐτοῦ τῇ μετουσίᾳ γίνεσθαι, τὰς χεῖρας χρηματίζων εἰς τύπον σταυροῦ, οὕτω προσίτω, καὶ διχίσθω τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς χάριτος· τοὺς γὰρ ἐκ χειροῦ ἢ ἄλλης ὕλης ἀντὶ χειρὸς τινα δοχεῖα κατασκευάζοντες πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξου ὑποδοχὴν, καὶ δι’ αὐτῶν τῆς ἀχράντου κοινωνίας ἀξιουμένους, οὐδαμῶς προσίμεθα, ὡς προτιμῶντας θῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκόνας τὴν ἄψυχον ὕλην καὶ ὑποχέριον· οἱ δὲ τις ἄλλῃ τῆς ἀχράντου κοινωνίας μεταδιδὼς τοῖς ταιαῦτα δοχεῖα προσφίρουσιν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφοριζέσθω, καὶ ὁ ταῦτα ἐπιφερόμενος.

^q Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. sect. xviii.—See sect. v. note (^z), p. 247.

SECT. VIII. — *The Eucharist usually delivered to the People with a certain Form of Words, to which they answered, "Amen."*

The next thing observable is, that the priest, in delivering the elements to the people, used a certain form of words, to which the people answered, "Amen." The form at first seems to have been no more than this: "The body of Christ;" and "The blood of Christ;" to each of which the people subjoined "Amen." Tertullian is thought to refer to this, when he asks a Christian who was used to frequent the Roman theatres,^r "How he could give testimony to a gladiator with that mouth, wherewith he was wont to say 'Amen' in the holy mysteries?" But that may refer as well to the Amen which they used at the end of the great consecration-prayer, as to this form, at the delivery. However, Cornelius, bishop of Rome, not long after, speaks expressly of it. For he says,^s "Novatian was used to make the people of his party swear by the body and blood of Christ, when he delivered the eucharist to them, that they would not forsake his party and go over to Cornelius. So," says he, "every man, instead of saying 'Amen,' when he takes the bread, is forced to say, 'I will not return to Cornelius.'" The author of the Constitutions speaks of the form in this manner:^t "Let the bishop give the oblation, saying, 'The body of Christ:' and let the receiver answer, 'Amen.' Let the deacon hold the cup, and when he gives it, say, 'The

^r Tertul. de Spectac. c. xiv. Quale est . . . ex ore, quo Amen in sanetum protuleris, gladiator testimonium reddere?

^s Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. c. xliii. p. 245, (p. 199, D. edit. Amstelod. vel potius Colon. 1695.) Ποίησας τὰς προσφορὰς, καὶ διανίμων ἑκάστη τὴν μίραν, καὶ ἰπιδίδους τοῦτο ἑνὶν ἑντὶ τοῦ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς ταλαιπώρους ἀνθρώπους ἀναγκάζει, κατὰ τὴν ἀμφοτέρωθεν τῆς χειρὸς τὰς τοῦ λαβόντος, καὶ μὴ ἀφ' ἑσ' ἂν ἑνὶν ὡς ἑνὶν ταῦτα τοῖς γὰρ ἐκείνου χρῆσθαι λόγους: "Ὁμοῦν μοι κατὰ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μὴδὲ ποτὶ με παταλιστῶν καὶ ἰσιστρέψαι πρὸς Κορηλίον καὶ ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους οὐ πρότερον γίνεσθαι, εἰ μὴ πρότερον αὐτῷ καταράσονται καὶ ἐντὶ τοῦ εἰπὴν λαμβάνοντα τὸν ἄρτον ἐκείνου τὸ Ἄμην, οὐκ ἔστι ἀντὶ πρὸς Κορηλίον λόγους. Vales. p. 199, D.

^t Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiii. Ὁ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος δίδωσιν τὴν προσφορὰν, λίγαν, αἷμα Χριστοῦ καὶ ὁ διχομήνης λιγίαν, Ἄμην ὁ δὲ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν τὴν ποτήριον, καὶ ἰπιδίδους λιγίαν, αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς καὶ ὁ πῖνον λιγίαν, Ἄμην.

blood of Christ, the cup of life :’ and let him that drinks it say, ‘Amen.’” So St. Cyril^u bids his communicant receive the body of Christ, and say, “Amen.” And St. Ambrose,^v “The priest says to thee, ‘The body of Christ,’ and thou answerest, ‘Amen.’” The like, as to the people’s answering “Amen,” is noted by St. Austin,^w as the general practice of the whole world. And so by St. Jerom,^x Leo Magnus,^y and many others. By the time of Gregory the Great, the form of delivery was a little enlarged : for then they said,^z “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul.” And, by the time of Alcuin and Charles the Great, it was augmented into this form,^a “The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul unto everlasting life :” which is much the same with the former part of that which is now used in our liturgy. The Scotch liturgy also orders the people to answer, “Amen ;” which, we see, is conformable to ancient practice. The Romanists generally draw this answer of the people into an argument for transubstantiation : because saying “Amen” implies as much as the true body of Christ. But they might as well argue, that the bread is transubstantiated into the bodies of the people, and that they, too, are but one proper, substantial, true, numerical body with their Lord ; because St. Austin says this is one meaning of the body of Christ, to which, when the priest spake it, they answered “Amen :”

^u Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. n. xviii.—See before, sect. v. note (^z), p. 247.

^v Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iv. c. v. Dicit tibi sacerdos, ‘Corpus Christi ;’ et tu dicis, ‘Amen,’ id est, ‘Verum.’——Id. de Initiandis, c. ix. Post consecrationem sanguis nuncupatur, et tu dicis, ‘Amen.’

^w Aug. cont. Faust. lib. xii. c. x. Habet magnam vocem Christi sanguis in terra, quum eo accepto ab omnibus gentibus respondetur, ‘Amen.’

^x Hieron. Epist. lxii. ad Theoph. Qua conscientia ad eucharistiam accedam, et respondebo, ‘Amen ;’ quum de caritate dubitem porrigentis ?

^y Leo, Sermon. vi. de Jejunio Septimi Mensis, (Lugd. 1700, p. 175.) Sic sacre menae communicare debetis, ut nihil prorsus de veritate corporis Christi et sanguinis ambigatis. Hoc enim ore sumitur, quod fide creditur ; et frustra ab illis ‘Amen’ respondetur, a quibus contra id, quod accipitur, disputatur.

^z Joan. Diacon. Vit. Gregor. lib. ii. ap. Bon. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xvii. sect. iii. Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi conservet animam tuam !

^a Alcuin. de Offic. ap. Bon. ibid. Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam æternam.——Helgald. in Vita Roberti regis Galliae. A dante sacerdote dicitur, Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi sit tibi salus animæ et corporis. ap. Bon. ibid.

“Ye answer, ‘Amen,’” says he,^b “to what ye are [that is, the body of Christ], and, by your answer, subscribe to the truth of it. Thou hearest the priest say, ‘The body of Christ,’ and thou answerest, ‘Amen:’ be thou a member of the body of Christ, that thy Amen may be true.” In another place, he says,^c “It denoted their belief of the reality of Christ’s suffering for them; that his blood was truly shed for their sakes; and that they made profession of this by saying ‘Amen.’” This is true. And again,^d “Christ shed his blood upon the cross, for our sakes: and ye who are communicants, know what testimony ye bear to the blood which ye receive; for ye say ‘Amen’ to it. Ye know what that blood is ‘which was shed for many, for the remission of sins.’” So that in whatever sense we take it, there is no necessity of making it to signify a corporeal and substantial presence; which it is certain St. Austin never thought of.

SECT. IX.—*How Novatian and others abused the Communion to wicked purposes.*

It is here proper, before we pass on, to make a just reflection upon the horrible abuses of the communion committed by some against the true end and design of it, which was intended by Christ to represent our union with himself and one another; but wicked men made use of it to base ends and purposes. We have already heard how Novatian abused it to strengthen his schism, and bind men over by an oath upon it, that they would not desert his interest and party. And it was a like abuse that was some time allowed in the superstitious times of popery, under the general notion

^b Aug. Serm. ad Infantes, ap. Fulgent. de Baptismo Æthiopis, c. xi. Ad id quod estis, respondetis ‘Amen,’ et respondendo subscribitis. Audis ‘Corpus Christi,’ et respondes ‘Amen.’ Esto membrum corporis Christi, ut sit verum Amen tuum.

^c Ibid. Serm. de iv. Feria, sive Cultura Agni, tom. ix. p. 319. Quid dicit omnis homo, quando accipit sanguinem Christi? ‘Amen’ dicit. Quid est Amen? Verum est. Quid est verum? Quia fusus est sanguis Christi.

^d Ibid. Serm. xxix. de Verbis Apost. tom. x. p. 150. Christus in cruce pro nobis sanguinem fudit: et nostis, fideles, quale testimonium perhibeat sanguini, quem accepistis. Certe enim dicitis ‘Amen.’ Nostis, qui sit sanguis, qui pro multis effusus est in remissionem peccatorum.

of many other superstitious practices, called 'canonical purgations;' which was, that when any one was suspected of a crime, he was to purge himself by taking the sacrament upon it. Gratian cites a canon out of the Council of Worms, to this purpose: "Whereas it often happens, that thefts are committed in monasteries, and they that commit them are not known; we therefore order, that when the brethren are to purge themselves of such suspicions, mass shall be celebrated by the abbot, or some other appointed by him; and when it is ended, every one of them shall communicate, saying these words, 'Let the body of Christ be my purgation this day.'" But though this was allowed by a council, it is justly reckoned a great abuse by all sober men. Antonius Augustinus, in his emendations upon Gratian, passes this censure upon it,^f "That it is to be ascribed to the great corruption and filth of the times which allowed it." For even as the old Glosser upon Gratian observes,^g "The communion was not to be given to suspected persons;" as he proves from other laws, particularly the extravagant *De Purgatione Canonica*, cap. *Cum dilectis*. And therefore, he says, "This canon in Gratian was of no force, being disannulled in law." So that we need not scruple to call this a great abuse of the holy communion, though it had synodical authority some time to enjoin the practice of it. I know nothing hardly that exceeds it under pretence of religion, unless it be that more horrible abuse which Baronius^h himself relates out of the

* Conc. Wormat. c. xv. ap. Gratian. caus. ii. quæst. v. c. xxiii. Sæpe contingit, ut in monasteriis furta perpetrentur, et, qui hæc committunt, ignorentur. Idcirco statuimus, ut quando ipsi fratres de talibus se expurgare debuerint, missa ab abbate celebretur, vel ab aliquo cui ipse abbas præceperit, præsentibus fratribus: et sic expleta missa, omnes communicent in hæc verba, 'Corpus Domini sit mihi ad probationem hodie.'

^f Anton. Aug. de Emendat. Gratian. lib. i. dial. xv. p. 170. Hæc omnia sunt illorum temporum sordibus adscribenda.

^g Glossa in loc. Gratian. Huic capiti est derogatum, quia suspectis non est danda eucharistia.

^h Baron. an. 648, n. xv. (tom. viii. p. 391, edit. Antwerp. 1611.) Pyrrhus quum Roma discessisset, et Ravennam pervenisset, ut canis ad vomitum suum reversus est. Quo Papa Theodorus comperto, plenitudine convocata ecclesiæ, ad sepulchrum verticis apostolorum accessit, et Divino calice expostulato, ex vivifico sanguine in atramentum stillavit, et ita propria manu depositionem Pyrrhi excommunicati facit. Hanc excommunicationem Pyrrhi tunc per Theo-

Greek historians, concerning Pope Theodore and the Roman Council (an. 684), who, in their censure of Pyrrhus and Paulus, the Monothelite heretics, took blood out of the cup, and mingled it with ink; and therewith subscribed their condemnation. An unparalleled instance of intemperate zeal, for which there was neither law nor example in the Roman Church, as Baronius confesses, nor any instance like it; save one in the Greek Church, when Ignatius, in the Council of Constantinople (an. 869), made use of the blood in the sacred cup, instead of ink, to condemn his adversary Photius, as Baronius also tells us out of Nicetas,ⁱ in his Life of Ignatius. But I pass over these horrible abuses, more becoming Draco and his sanguinary laws, than the pens and practices of Christian bishops, and go on with the more innocent practices of the Primitive Church.

SECT. X.—*Proper Psalms for the Occasion usually sung while the People were Communicating.*

During the time of communicating, while the elements were distributed to the people, it was usual, in most places, for the singers, or all the people, to sing some psalm suitable to the occasion. The author of the Constitutions^k prescribes the thirty-third Psalm, which, in our division, is the thirty-fourth, for this purpose: "I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise shall be always in my mouth," which was chiefly sung upon the account of those words relating to the sacra-

dorum Papam Romæ factam annales (Theoph. xx. Heracl. Imper.) habent. Sed de sanguine Christi, ex calice distillato in atramentum, in signum maledictionis et damnationis æternæ, in ritibus sacris ecclesiæ Romanæ haud aliqua hujusmodi de his reperitur esse præscripta lex, vel factum ipsum aliquo alio, quod sciamus, declaratum exemplo.

ⁱ Baron. an. 869, tom. x. p. 428, (p. 416, n. xlvii. edit. Antwerp. 1618.) Hic non prætermittendum, quod habet Nicetas in Vita Ignatii, episcopos subscribentes damnationi Photii, in majorem hominis detestationem (quod factum legimus in damnatione Pyrrhi pseudopatriarchæ Monothelitæ) intinxisse calamus in sacrum sanguinem Christi. Ait enim: 'Subscribunt autem hujusmodi damnationi non simplici atramento facto chirographo, sed, horrendum dictu (ut ab his, qui id norunt, accepi), ipso videlicet Salvatoris sanguine calamus tingentes ita damnant Photium.' Hæc Nicetas.

^k Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiii. Παλμὸς δὲ λογίσθω τριακοντὲς τρίτος, ἐν τῇ μεταλαμβάνειν πάντας τοὺς λοιποὺς.

ment, "O taste, and see that the Lord is gracious," &c. For so St. Cyril more plainly declares, when he says,¹ "After this, you hear one singing with a Divine melody, and exhorting you to partake of the holy mysteries, and saying, 'O taste and see that the Lord is gracious.'" St. Jerom seems also to intimate, that they sung both this and the forty-fifth Psalm, when he says,^m "They received the eucharist always with a good conscience, hearing the Psalmist sing, 'O taste and see that the Lord is gracious:' and singing with him, 'My heart is inditing of a good matter; I speak of the things which I have made unto the king.'" This being a psalm peculiarly setting forth the praises of Christ, and the affection of the Church toward him: "Hearken, O daughter, and consider, incline thine ear, forget also thine own people, and thy father's house: so shall the king have pleasure in thy beauty; for he is thy Lord God, and worship thou him." In Afric, they seem to have delighted much in this custom; insomuch, that when one Hilarius, a tribune, railed against it, and all other singing of psalms at the altar, St. Austin wrote a book particularly in vindication of it, which is now lost, but he mentions it in his *Retractations*.ⁿ And both he and Tertullian seem to intimate, that, among other psalms, they sung the one hundred and thirty-third: "Behold how good and joyful a thing it is, brethren to dwell together in unity." For Tertullian says,^o "They were used to sing this psalm when

¹ Cyril. Mystag. Catech. v. sect. xvii. *Μισὰ ταῦτα ἀκούει τοῦ ψάλλοντος μὲν τὰ μέλους Διῶν, προετραπομένου ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων, καὶ λήγοντος, Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδτε, ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κύριος.*

^m Hieron. Epist. xxviii. ad Lucin. Boeticum. Utinam possimus eucharistiam absque condemnatione nostri, et pungente conscientia, semper accipere, et Psalmistam audire dicentem, 'Gustate et videte, quoniam suavis est Dominus;' et cum eo canere, 'Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum.' . . . 'Audi, filia, et vide, et inclina aurem tuam, et obliviscere populi et domus patris tui. Et concupiscet rex decorem tuum, quoniam ipse est Deus, Dominus tuus, incurva te ei.' (Venet. i. p. 434, E.)

ⁿ Aug. *Retract.* lib. ii. c. xi. Morem, qui tunc esse apud Carthaginem cœperat, ut hymni ad altare dicerentur de Psalmorum libro, sive ante oblationem, sive quum distribueretur populo quod fuisset oblatum, maledica reprehensione ubicumque poterat lacerabat, &c. Huic respondi, et vocatur liber contra Hilarium. (i. 33, C.)

^o Tertul. de Jejun. c. xiii. 'Vide quam bonum et quam jucundum, habitare

they supped together.” By which, most probably, he means the Lord’s supper. And St. Austin says,^p “It was a psalm so noted and well known, by its constant use, that they who knew nothing of the psalter, could repeat that psalm, as having often heard it sung,” probably at the altar. And he seems to say,^q that they sung the thirty-third Psalm upon the same occasion. For he says expressly they sung it daily, “I will bless the Lord at all times, his praise shall ever be in my mouth.” Which, considering how many writers before speak of it as sung at the distribution of the elements, it is probable St. Austin means the same, that it was sung daily at the altar. St. Chrysostom says they sung the hundred and forty-fifth Psalm upon this occasion, chiefly upon the account of those words in it, “The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their meat in due season.” For he interprets this of their spiritual meat at the Lord’s table. “This psalm,” says he,^r “is diligently to be noted : for this is the psalm which has these words, which they that are initiated in the holy mysteries, sing continually in concert, saying, ‘The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their meat in due season.’ For he that is made a son, and partaker of the spiritual table, does justly give glory to

fratres in unum.’ Hoc tu psallere non facile nosti, nisi quo tempore cum compluribus cœnas.

^p Aug. in Psalm. cxxxiii. p. 629. Psalmus brevis est, sed valde notus, et nominatus, ‘Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum,’ &c. Ita sonus ille dulcis est, ut et qui psalterium nesciunt, ipsum versum cantent.

^q Ibid. p. 630. Impletum est in eo, quod quotidie cantamus, si et moribus consonemus, ‘Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore. Semper laus ejus in ore meo.’

^r Chrysostom. in Psalm. cxliv. tom. iii. p. 594, (p. 516, edit. Francof. 1698.) Μετὰ ἀκριβείας τούτην μάλιστα προσίχυν ἄξιον τῷ ψαλμῷ οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τὰ ῥήματα ἔχων ταῦτα, ἅπτε οἱ μιμηταὶ συνιῶς ὑποβάλλουσι, λίγοντες, οἱ ὀρθαλμοὶ πάντων εἰς σὶ ἱλαρίζουσι, καὶ σὺ δίδως τὴν τροφὴν αὐτῶν ἐν εὐκαιρίᾳ· ὁ γὰρ γινόμενος υἱὸς, καὶ τραπίζῃ ἀπολαύων πνευματικῆς, δοῦναι δίκαιος ἂν εἴῃ τὸν πατέρα· υἱὸς γὰρ, φησι, δοῦναι τὸν πατέρα, καὶ δούλος τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ φοβηθήσεται· γίγοντας υἱὸς, καὶ τραπίζῃ ἀπολαύων πνευματικῆς, σιτούμενος τὰς σάρκας καὶ τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἀναγινῶσάν σι· ἀποδίδου τοίνυν τῆς τοσαύτης εὐεργισίας τὴν ἀμοιβήν, καὶ δοῦναι τὸν τοιαῦτα περιερχόμενα, καὶ ἀναγινώσκων τὰ ῥήματα, ῥύθμιζέ σου τὴν γνώμην πρὸς τὰ λιγόμενα, λίγων ὑφάσω σε ὁ Θεὸς μου, ὁ Βασιλεὺς μου, πολλὴν ἐπιδικήσουσιν τὴν οἰκίωσιν, ἵνα καὶ περὶ σοῦ λίγη ὁ Θεὸς, ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ· ἰγὼ ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ.

his Father. Thou art a son, and partaker of the spiritual table; thou feedest upon that flesh and blood which regenerated thee: therefore, give thanks to him that vouchsafes thee so great a blessing; glorify him who grants thee these favours. When thou readest the words, compose and tune thy soul to what is said; and when thou sayest, 'I will exalt thee, my God, my King' [which are the first words of this psalm], shew thy great love and affection to him, that he may say to thee, as he said to Abraham, 'I am thy God.' In the liturgy which goes under St. Chrysostom's name,* there is mention made of the people's singing at this time, but no psalm specified, as here in his genuine works. In the Liturgy, called St. James' of Jerusalem,† the words of the thirty-fourth Psalm, "O taste, and see that the Lord is gracious," are appointed to be sung by the singers. St. Mark's Liturgy appoints the forty-second Psalm,‡ "As the hart desireth the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God." And Cotelarius has observed,§ that, in some ancient rituals, at the end of Gregory's *Sacramentarium*, the hundred and thirty-ninth Psalm is appointed: "O Lord, thou hast searched me out, and known me," &c. So that though the custom of singing psalms, in this part of the service, was universal, the particular psalms varied according to the wisdom and choice of the precentor, or the different rules and usages of different Churches. I have now stated and resolved the several questions and cases that may be put, concerning the manner of communicating in the ancient Church: and there remains but one thing more to be considered, which was the solemn thanksgiving and prayers after receiving, which may be included with some other concomitant rites, in the general name of their 'post-communion service:' of which we will discourse in the following chapter.

* Chrysostom. Liturg. tom. iv. p. 618.

† Jacob. Liturg. Bibl. Patr. Græc. Lat. tom. ii. p. 20.

‡ Marci Liturg. ibid. p. 40. Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum, ita desiderat anima mea ad te, Deus.

§ Cotelar. in Constit. lib. viii. c. xiii. n. lxxix.

CHAPTER VI.

OF THEIR POST-COMMUNION SERVICE.

SECT. I.—*The Communion-Service closed with several Sorts of Thanksgiving. First, the Deacon's Bidding-Prayer and Thanksgiving.*

WHEN all the people had communicated, and the deacons had removed the remainder of the elements into the *pastophoria*, or place appointed for their reception; it was usual first for a deacon to admonish the people to return thanks for the benefits which they had received. The form of this exhortation in the Constitutions runs thus:^a “Now that we have received the precious body and the precious blood of Christ, let us give thanks to him that hath vouchsafed to make us partakers of his holy mysteries; and let us beseech him that they may not be to our condemnation, but salvation; for the benefit of our soul and body, for the preservation of us in piety, for the remission of our sins, and obtaining of the life of the world to come.” Then he bids them rise up, and commend themselves to God, by Christ. Upon which the bishop makes a prayer of thanksgiving and commendation of the people to God, in the following words:^b

SECT. II.—*The Bishop's Thanksgiving, or Commendation of the People to God.*

“O Lord God Almighty, the Father of thy Christ, thy blessed Son; who hearest those that with an upright heart call upon thee, who knowest the supplications of those that in silence pray unto thee; we give thee thanks for that thou

^a Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiv. Μιταλαβόντες τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ καταξιώνοντι ἡμᾶς μιταλαβεῖν τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ μυστηρίων, καὶ παρακαλίσωμεν, μὴ εἰς κρίμα, ἀλλ' εἰς σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν γενέσθαι, εἰς ὀφίλιαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, εἰς φυλακὴν ἐνσελεύας, εἰς ἄφισιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. (i. 486.)

^b Ibid. c. xv. Δίς ποτε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ Πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τοῦ ἐυλογητοῦ παιδὸς, ὁ τῶν μιστ' ἐνθύτητος ἐπικαλουμένων σε ἰσήμερος, ὁ καὶ τῶν σιωπώντων ἐπιστάμινος τὰς ἐντιύξεις' εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, ὅτι καταξίωσας ἡμᾶς μιταλαβεῖν τῶν

hast vouchsafed to make us partakers of thy holy mysteries, which thou hast given us for the confirmation or full assurance of those things which we steadfastly believe and know, for the preservation of our piety, for the remission of our sins: because the name of thy Christ is called upon us, and we are united unto thee. Thou that hast separated us from the communion of the ungodly, unite us with them that are sanctified unto thee; confirm us in thy truth by the coming of thy Holy Spirit, and his resting upon us; reveal unto us what things we are ignorant of; supply what we are deficient in; and strengthen us in what we know. Preserve thy priests unblamable in thy service; keep our princes in peace; our governors in righteousness; the air in good temperature; the fruits of the earth in plenty; and the whole world, by thy almighty providence. Pacify the nations that are inclined to war; convert those that go astray; sanctify thy people; preserve those that are in virginity; keep those that are married in thy faith; strengthen those that are in chastity; bring infants to mature age; confirm those that are newly baptized; instruct the catechumens; and make them fit and worthy of baptism; and gather us all into the kingdom of heaven, through Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom, unto thee, and the Holy Spirit, be glory, honour, and adoration, world without end. Amen."

ἀγίων σου μυστηρίων, ἃ παρέσχου ἡμῖν, εἰς πληροφορίαν τῶν καλῶν ἠγνωσμένων εἰς φυλακὴν τῆς ἐπιστάσεως, εἰς ἄφρισιν πλημμελημάτων ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου ἐπισκέπληται ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ σοὶ προσφαινώμεθα· ὁ χωρίσας ἡμᾶς τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ποιωνίας, ἴωσεν ἡμᾶς μετὰ τῶν καθωσιωμένων σοι· στήριξεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, τῇ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπιφαιότησει· τὰ ἀγνοούμενα ἀποκάλυψεν· τὰ λείποντα προσαναπλήρωσεν· τὰ ἠγνωσμένα κέρτυεν· τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀμώμους διαφύλαξεν ἐν τῇ λατρείᾳ σου· τοὺς βασιλεῖς διατήρησεν ἐν εἰρήνῃ· τοὺς ἔρχοντας ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· τοὺς εἰσες ἐν ὑπεραίᾳ· τοὺς παρτοὺς ἐν εὐφορίᾳ· τὸν κόσμον ἐν πανακλίᾳ προνοίᾳ· τὰ ἴδιον τὰ πολεμικὰ πρᾶνεν· τὰ πειπλανημένα ἐπίστρεψεν· τὸν λαόν σου ἁγίασον· τοὺς ἐν παρθένοιᾳ διατήρησεν· τοὺς ἐν γάμῳ διαφύλαξεν ἐν πίστει· τοὺς ἐν ἀγνίᾳ ἐνδυνάμωσεν· τὰ νήπια ἄδρυεν· τοὺς νοσιλεῖς βιβαίωσεν· τοὺς ἐν κατηχῇ παιδίσκον καὶ τῆς μύσεως ἄξιους ἀνᾶδειξεν· καὶ πάντας ἐπισυνάγαγε εἰς τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλίαν, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν μεθ' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, τιμὴ, καὶ εἰσας, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· Ἀμήν.

SECT. III. — *The Bishop's Benediction.*

After this, the deacon bids the people bow their heads to God in Christ, and receive the benediction. Then the bishop pronounces the benediction in this following prayer : “ Almighty God, and true, with whom no one can compare, who art every^cwhere, and present unto all, yet not in them as things of which they consist, who art circumscribed by no place, not grown old with time, nor bounded by ages ; who art without generation, and needest no preserver ; who art above all corruption, uncapable of change, and unalterable by nature ; that dwellest in light which no one can approach unto, and art invisible by nature ; that art known to all rational natures that seek thee with an upright heart, and art apprehended by those that search after thee with a pure mind ; O thou God of Israel, the Israel that truly sees thee, and the people that believes in Christ, shew thyself propitious, and hear me for thy name’s sake ; bless this people that bow their necks unto thee ; and grant them the petitions of their heart that are expedient for them ; and suffer none of them to fall from thy kingdom ; but sanctify them, keep and protect, help and deliver them from the adversary, and from every enemy ; preserve their houses, and defend their going out and their coming in : for to thee belongs glory, praise, majesty, worship, and adoration : and to thy son Jesus, thy Christ, our Lord, and God, and King ; and to the Holy Spirit, now and for ever, world without end. Amen.”

^c Constitut. lib. viii. c. xv. ‘Ο Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἀσύγκριτος, ὁ πανταχοῦ ὢν, καὶ ταῖς πᾶσι παρὼν, καὶ ἐν οὐδενὶ ὡς ἐνὶ οὐδενὶ ὑπάρχων, ὁ τόποις μὴ περιγραφόμενος, ὁ χρόνοις μὴ παλαιούμενος, ὁ αἰῶσι μὴ περατούμενος, ὁ λόγοις μὴ παραγόμενος, ὁ γένεσι μὴ υποκείμενος, ὁ φυλακῇ μὴ διόμενος, ὁ φθορᾷ ἀνώτερος, ὁ τροπῇ ἀντιστατικός, ὁ φύσει ἀπαλλοιώτος, ὁ φῶς οὐκ ὄντων ἀπερέστων, ὁ τῇ φύσει ἀόρατος, ὁ γνωστὸς πάσαις ταῖς μετ’ οὐνοῦ καὶ ἐκτεταταῖς σὲ λογικαῖς φύσεσιν, ὁ καταλαμβανόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν οὐνοῖς ἐκτετατούτων σὲ, ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ὁρῶντος, τοῦ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσαντος λαοῦ σου, εὐμενὲς γινόμενος ἐπάκουσέν μου διὰ τὸ ἐνομά σου, καὶ εὐλόγησον τοὺς σοὶ κεκληκίοντας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἀρχίνους καὶ δὸς αὐτοῖς τὰ αἰτήματα τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, τὰ ἐπὶ συμφέροντι καὶ μεθίνα αὐτῶν ἀπέβλητον ποιήσης ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας σου· ἀλλὰ ἁγιάσον αὐτούς· φρουρήσον· σκίπασον· ἀντιλαβοῦ· ῥύσαι τοῦ ἑλλοσίου καὶ παντὸς ἰχθύου τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν φύλαξον· τὰς εἰσόδους αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἐξόδους φρουρήσον· ὅτι σοὶ δόξα, αἶνος, μεγαλοπρέπεια, εἰς αἶνα, προσκυνήσεις, καὶ τῷ σὺ πᾶσι Ἰησοῦ, τῷ Χριστῷ σου, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, καὶ Θεῷ, καὶ Βασιλεῖ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· Ἀμήν.

SECT. IV.—*The Deacon's Form of dismissing the People with the short Prayer, "Go in Peace."*

After this, the deacon used a short form of words in the nature of a prayer for peace, which was the signal wherewith he dismissed the whole assembly; intimating that the whole service was now finished; and therefore praying that the peace of God might continue with them, and preserve them, he said, Ἀπολύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, 'Depart in peace.' This was the usual form of breaking up all religious assemblies in the Greek Church, as we have noted before,^d in speaking of the daily morning-service out of this author: and we are assured of it from St. Chrysostom,^e who, speaking of the frequent use of that short prayer of salutation, "Peace be with you," particularly takes notice of the deacon's using it at the dismissal of the assembly: "The deacon," says he, "when he dismisses you from this meeting, does it with this prayer, Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, 'Go in peace.'" Whence we may learn, that they did not use it as an empty form, but as a short solemn prayer, to send them away with a benediction, or the blessing of God upon them.

SECT. V.—*What Account we have of these Prayers in other Writers.*

As for the other prayers used in this part of the service, we have no particular account of them in other writers; but they tell us, in general, that such forms of praise and thanksgiving were always used after the communion. St. Austin says,^f "When all was ended, and every one had received the communion, a solemn thanksgiving concluded the whole action." And so Cyril of Jerusalem^g bids his newly baptized communicants "stay, when the communion

^d Book xiii. chap. x. sect. viii.

^e Chrysostom. Hom. lii. in eos, qui pascha jejulant, tom. v. p. 713, (Hom. lv. p. 637, edit. Francof.) Ὁ διάκονος . . . τῆς συνόδου ταύτης ἀπολύων ἡμᾶς, τοῦτο ἡμῶν ἐπιύχεται λίγων, Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

^f Aug. Epist. lix. ad Paulin. quæst. v. Quibus peractis et participato tanto sacramento, gratiarum actio cuncta concludit.

^g Cyril. Catech. Mystag. v. sect. xix. Ἐῖτα ἀναμείνας τὴν εὐχὴν, εὐχαρίστησεν ὁ Θεὸς, τῇ καταξίωσιν αὐτοῦ τοῦ τῶν σηλομένων μυστηρίου.

was done, to give thanks to God, who had vouchsafed to make him a partaker of so great mysteries." St. Chrysostom has a long invective^h against those who would not stay these last prayers, but as soon as they had communicated themselves, would be gone, and leave their brethren to give thanks alone: whom he compares to Judas, who left the apostles after supper, before the last hymn was sung; but all the other apostles staid to sing the hymn with their Lord; from whose example the Church took up the custom of making these last prayers after the communion. It is an excellent passage, and therefore I will transcribe it at length in his own words. "Would you have me tell you, what is the cause of noise and tumult in the Church? It is, because we shut not the doors upon you all the time of Divine service, but suffer you to draw off and go home before the last thanksgiving; which is a great contempt of God's ordinance. What meanest thou, O man, in so doing? Christ is present; the angels stand by him; the tremendous table is spread; thy brethren are yet communicating; and

^h Chrysostom. Hom. xxiv. de Bapt. Christi, tom. i. p. 317, (p. 281, edit. Francof.) Βούλισθε, ἴψω, πόθεν ὁ θόρυβος καὶ ἡ κραυγὴ γίνεται; ὅτι οὐ διὰ παντός ὑμῖν τὰς θύρας ἀποκλείομεν, ἀλλὰ συγχωροῦμεν πρὸ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς εὐχαριστίας ἀποσπῶν καὶ ἀναχωρεῖν οἰκαδὲ· ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ πολλὰς ἀν εἰη καταφρονήσιως· τί ποιεῖς, ἄνθρωπε; τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρόντος, τῶν ἀγγέλων παριστάτων, τῆς φρικτῆς ταύτης τραπέζης περικυμίνης, τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου μυσταγωγουμένων ἔτι, αὐτὸς καταλιπὼν ἀποσπῶς; καὶ ἰπὶ δῖπνον μὲν εἰ κληθῇς, καὶν πρότιρον κορισθῇς, οὐ τολμᾷς, τῶν ἄλλων ἀνακυμίνων, ἀναχωρῆσαι πρὸ τῶν φίλων αὐτός· ἵνα τοῦτα δὲ τῶν φρικτῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστηρίων ἐπιτιλουμένων, τῆς ἱερᾶς τιλιτῆς συνιστάσεως ἔτι, καταλιμπάνεις ἐν μίση πάντα, καὶ ἀναχωρεῖς; καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα συγγνώμης ἔξια; ποίας δὲ ἀπολογίας; βούλισθε ἴψω, τίνας ἔργον ποιῶσιν οἱ πρὸ τῆς συμπληρώσεως ἀναχωροῦντες, καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστηρίους αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐπιφέροντες τῇ τίλει τῆς τραπέζης; τάχα φορτικὸν ἵσται τὸ μάλλον ῥηθῆσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἀναγκαῖον λιχθῆναι διὰ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν βεβημίαν· ἔτι κινώμενος τὸ ἴσχατον δῖπνον ὁ Ἰούδας, τὸ κατὰ τὴν τιλιτωσίαν νύκτα κίειν, τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀνακυμίνων αὐτὸς προσηδήσας ἔξελθ'· κίειν τοίνυν μμῶνται καὶ οὗτοι, πρὸ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς ἀποσπῶντες εὐχαριστίας· κίειν γὰρ εἰ μὴ ἔξελθαι, οὐκ ἂν ἰγίνετο προδότης· εἰ μὴ κατίλειπε τοὺς συμμαθητὰς, οὐκ ἂν ἀπώλειτο· εἰ μὴ τῆς ἀγίας ἱαυτὸν ἀπὲρρῆξιν, οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸν εὖριν ὁ λύκος μῖνον, καὶ κατέφαγεν· εἰ μὴ τοῦ ποιμῆνος ἱαυτὸν ἐχώρισεν, οὐκ ἂν θηριόλωτος γίγονεν διὰ δὴ τοῦτο κίειν μὲν μετὰ Ἰουδαίων· οὗτοι δὲ μετὰ τοῦ δισπότου ὑμῆσαντες ἔξελθον· ὁρᾷς ὅτι ἡ ἰσχυρὴ μετὰ τὴν θυσίαν εὐχὴ κατ'· κίειν γίνεται τὸν εὐπον; — Hom. lxxxii. al. lxxxiii. in Matth. (p. 864, edit. cit.) Εὐχαρίστησι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ δοῦναι τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἵνα καὶ ἡμῖς εὐχαριστῶμεν· εὐχαρίστησι καὶ ὕμνησι μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι, ἵνα καὶ ἡμῖς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῶμεν.

dost thou desert them and fly off? If thou art called to a common entertainment, thou dost not presume, whilst the rest are sitting, to depart before thy friends, though thou hast filled thyself before them: and dost thou here leave all and depart, whilst the holy mysteries of Christ are celebrating, and the sacred offices performing? What pardon can be expected, what apology can be made, for this? Shall I tell you plainly, whose work they are a-doing, who thus depart before all is finished, and wait not for the eucharistical hymns at the end of the supper? It may, perhaps, seem a hard and odious saying, but it is necessary to be said, to reprove the negligence of many. When Judas communicated at the last supper in that last night, whilst all the rest were sitting at table, he stole off and went out: and they imitate him, who go away before the last thanksgiving. For, if he had not gone out, he had not been made the traitor; if he had not deserted his fellow-disciples, he had not perished; if he had not broken away from the flock, the wolf had not found him alone; if he had not separated himself from the shepherd, he had not been a prey to the wild beast. Upon this account we find him among the Jews; but the rest stay to sing a hymn, and go forth with their Lord. Do you not now see, that the last prayers, after the sacrifice, take their rise from that example?" Thus far St. Chrysostom, who seems to intimate, that they had not only prayers, but also psalms and hymns of thanksgiving, in imitation of our Saviour's singing a hymn after his last supper with his disciples. And it is very probable, from what St. Chrysostom tells us in another place, that the Church had such an affection for David's Psalms, that she used and interspersed them in all her offices. *Primus, et medius, et novissimus est David,*¹ 'David was in the beginning, and middle, and end of her services.' It is true, the author of the Constitutions takes no notice of psalms or hymns in the forementioned place; but, in another place,² where he has also a prayer, μετὰ τὴν μετέαληψιν, 'after parti-

¹ Chrysostom. Hom. vi. de Pœnitentia in edit. Latinis.

² Constitut. lib. vii. c. xxvii. Μαριναθά· ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ· εὐλογημένος ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· Θεὸς Κύριος, ὁ ἐπιφανείς ἡμῖν ἐν σαρκί. (i. 430.)

cipation,' besides the thanksgiving, there is order to sing *Maranatha*, that is, 'the kingdom of God, or the Lord cometh;' and also, "Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: blessed be the Lord our God, who was manifested to us in the flesh." Which seems to imply, that there were different usages in different Churches; and that this author made his collections vary sometimes from themselves, by interposing the rites of different Churches. In the old Gothic Missal published by Mabillon, there is nothing appointed after the communion but only two prayers, the one called *post communionem*, and the other *collectio*, 'the collect,' or 'concluding prayer.' And it is much after the same manner in the Mozarabic Liturgy, of which Mabillon gives a specimen or two in his Appendix. But, in the Greek liturgies, as that under the name of St. James,^k besides the prayers, there are several short hymns and praises collected out of the Psalms, and other Scriptures, appointed to be said after the communion: as that of the fifty-seventh Psalm, "Set up thyself, O God, above the heavens, and thy glory above all the earth." And, "Blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth for evermore." And, "Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Save thy people, O God, and bless thine heritage." And, "O let our mouth be filled with thy praise, that we may sing of thy glory and honour all the day long." (Psalm lxxi. 7.) So in St. Chrysostom's Liturgy,^l the people are appointed to sing those words of the hundred and thirteenth Psalm, "Blessed be the name of the Lord, from this time forth, for evermore." And the whole thirty-fourth Psalm, "I will always give thanks unto the Lord: his praise shall ever be in my mouth."

SECT. VI.—*The Thanksgiving always made in the Plural Number by the whole Body of the Church.*

And it is observable, that, in all the ancient forms, the thanksgiving-prayers are always in the plural number, representing the whole body of the communicants as return-

^k Liturg. Jacobi, Bibl. Patr. Græc. Lat. tom. ii. p. 21.

^l Chrysostom. Liturg. *ibid.* p. 87, et inter Opera, tom. iv. p. 621

ing their praises to God for the mercies they had received. For then there were no private nor solitary masses, where the priest says the office alone by himself without any hearers, or communicates alone without any partakers; but they all assisted, and communicated together: and so long it was very rational and proper to return a general thanksgiving for the benefits of the communion which they had all received. But, since private and solitary masses came in, all these forms are very improper and absurd, to tell God they have all received the sacrament, and bless him for it, when none has received it but one, and, sometimes, none has so much as heard the office, but the priest alone that repeats it. Yet these offices now stand in the Roman Mass,^m to the eternal reproach of those that abuse them; for they still say, *Quod ore sumpsimus*, &c. “ ‘ That which we have received with our mouths,’ O Lord, grant that we may receive with a pure mind; and, of a temporal gift, make it unto us an eternal remedy.” And there are many other prayers in the same tenour, all which suppose many to have communicated, when yet no one has received but the priest alone. Bonaⁿ confesses this is not according to the primitive custom: for those prayers were instituted, at first, for communicants, when all, or a great part of the Church, communicated together; for, otherwise, the very name of communion would here be improperly used, if more than one did not partake of the sacrifice. And all he has to say for their retaining those prayers in the mass, when the use of them by private mass is become so improper, is only this: “ That though the ancient custom of many communicating together be left off, yet no change is made in the prayers; but they are retained still, to shew us what was done anciently, and

^m Missal. Roman. p. 24, de Ritu Celebrandi Missæ, et in Canone Missæ, p. 306. Quod ore sumimus, Domine, pura mente capiamus, et de munere temporali fiat nobis remedium sempiternum.

ⁿ Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xx. sect. i. and ii. Istæ orationes pro communicantibus institutæ sunt, quando omnes vel plerique, qui aderant sacrificio, communicabant: nam et ipsum communionis vocabulum improprie heic usurparetur, nisi plures de eodem sacrificio participarent. . . . Quamvis autem mos ille desierit, nihil tamen in orationibus immutatum est, sed ideo retentæ sunt, ut sciamus, quid olim factum sit, et ex ipso precationum tenore ad pristinum fervorem excitemur. (Antwerp. 1677, p. 606.)

to excite us, by the very tenour of the prayers, to return to the primitive fervour." How happy would it be, if the Roman Church would, in all things, observe this rule, and return to the laudable practice and simplicity of the ancient Church; reforming her offices by the primitive standard, and casting away all those corruptions, which appear, from the whole series of this history, to be manifest innovations, either privately crept in by connivance and negligence, in times of ignorance; or else forcibly imposed by tyranny and power, contrary to the usages of the ancient Church, and many times to the very design of Divine service, and the natural intent of holy institutions: as it is plain in the case of having Divine service in an unknown tongue, and worshipping saints and angels, and images and crosses, with Divine worship, and dividing the sacrament, and ministering it only in one kind, and many other things of the like nature: which, as they contradict the very end of the Divine ordinances, and the natural design of God's institutions; so they run counter to the whole practice of the ancient Church, as any one may see, by considering the allegations produced in these collections, in which I have endeavoured to point out as well the rise of errors, and the original of corruptions in latter ages, as the true ancient practice of the Primitive Church, in all the several parts of Divine service relating to the ordinary worship of God.

And here I should have put an end to this account, but that there are a few questions more that may be asked concerning some appendages and circumstances of the communion, which it will be proper to answer in this place. As, 1. How they were used to dispose of the remains of the eucharist after communicating? 2. What was their usage and practice in regard to their *agape*, or 'feast of charity,' so famous in ancient history? 3. What preparation they required, as necessary to communicants, to qualify them for a worthy reception? 4. What time they administered the Lord's supper; and how often they exhorted or obliged all persons to receive it? I will give as short an answer as I can to these questions, and therewith put an end to this discourse.

CHAPTER VII.

HOW THE REMAINS OF THE EUCHARIST WERE DISPOSED OF;
AND OF THEIR COMMON ENTERTAINMENT, CALLED *AGAPE*,
OR 'FEAST OF CHARITY.'

SECT. I. — *Some Part of the Eucharist anciently reserved
for particular Uses.*

WE have observed before, in several parts of this Book, that some part of the eucharist was commonly reserved for several particular uses: to be sent to the absent, and communicate the sick, and to testify the communion of distant churches one with another. And this was one way of disposing of the remains of the consecrated elements when the communion was ended: to which, I conceive, the author of the Constitutions had regard, when he orders the deacon^a to carry what remained into the *pastophoria*, or 'vestry,' which was the repository for all holy things belonging to the Church.

SECT. II. — *The rest divided among the Communicants.*

If any thing remained over and above what was necessary for these uses, then, by other rules, it was to be divided among the communicants, as appears from the canons of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria; one of which is to this purpose:^b "Let the clergy and the faithful, that is, the communicants, divide among themselves the oblations of the eucharist, after all have participated, and let not a catechumen eat or drink of them."

^a Constitut. lib. viii. c. xiii. "Όταν πάντες μεταλάβωσι καὶ πᾶσαι, λαβόντες οἱ διάκονοι τὰ περισσεύσαντα, εἰσφιλίσωσιν εἰς τὰ παστοφόρια. (i. 486.)

^b Theoph. c. viii. (ap. Bever. tom. ii. Pandect. p. 173.) Τὰ προσφερόμενα εἰς λόγον θυσίας, μετὰ τὰ ἀναλισκόμενα εἰς τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων χρείαν, οἱ κληρικοὶ διακινεῖσθωσαν, καὶ μήτε κατηχούμενος ἐκ τούτων ἐσθίτω ἢ πίντω, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον οἱ πληρεῖς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς πιστοὶ ἀδελφοί.

SECT. III. — *This Division of the consecrated Elements a distinct Thing from the Division of the other Oblations.*

Some learned persons^c confound this division, or consumption of the consecrated elements, with that other division of the oblations among the clergy, and allege the author of the Constitutions for it, as if he intended this when he says,^d “ Let the deacons divide what remains of the mystical *eulogiæ*, by the orders of the bishop or presbyters, among the clergy; to the bishops, four parts; to the presbyter, three parts; to the deacon, two parts; to the rest of the clergy, subdeacons, readers, singers, deaconesses, one part. For this is acceptable to God, that every one should be honoured according to his dignity.” It is plain, he speaks not here of the consecrated elements, but of the division of the people’s oblations among the clergy, as Cotelierius rightly expounds it: for this was one way of maintaining the clergy in those days, as has been more fully shewn^e in another place; and though he calls these by the name of the ‘mystical *eulogiæ*,’ yet that does not determine it to the consecrated elements: for, as has been noted before, *eulogiæ* is a common name, that signifies both. And Socrates takes it for the oblations in this very case, when speaking of Chrysanthus, the Novatian bishop, he says,^f “ He never received any thing of the Church, save two loaves of the *eulogiæ* on the Lord’s day.” Where he certainly means, not two loaves of the eucharist, but of the other oblations of the people, which it was customary for the clergy to have their proportioned shares in.

^c L’Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, chap. vii. p. 213.

^d Constitut. lib. viii. c. xxxi. Τὰς περισσεύουσας ἐν τοῖς μυστικοῖς εὐλογίας, κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἢ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οἱ διάκονοι διανομίσωσιν τῷ κλήρῳ· τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ μέρη τέσσαρα, πρεσβυτέρῳ μέρη τρία, διακόνῳ μέρη δύο· τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ὑποδιακόνις, ἢ ἀναγνώσταις, ἢ ψάλταις, ἢ διακονίσσαις, μέρος ἓν· τοῦτο γὰρ καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδικτον ἰνόπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵκαστον τιμᾶσθαι κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀξίαν. (P. 495.)

^e Book v. chap. iv. sect. i.

^f Socrat. lib. vii. c. xii. Ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν οὐδὲν ἰδίξατο, πλὴν κατὰ κυριακὴν δύο ἄρτους τῶν εὐλογιῶν ἱλάμβανεν.

SECT. IV.—*The Remains of the Eucharist sometimes given to innocent Children.*

Sometimes what remained of the eucharist, was distributed among the innocent children of the Church; for, as I have briefly hinted before, whilst the communion of infants continued in the Church, nothing was more usual in many places than both to give children the communion at the time of consecration, and also to reserve what remained unconsumed, for them to partake of some day in the week following. Thus it was appointed by the second Council of Mascon, in France (an. 588),^a “That if any remains of the sacrifice, after the service was ended, were laid up in the vestry; he, who had the care of them, should, on Wednesday or Friday, bring the innocents to church fasting, and then sprinkling the remains with wine, make them all partake of them.” And Evagrius says,^b “It was the custom of old, at Constantinople, to do the same: for when they had much remains of the body of Christ left, they were used to call in the children that went to school, and distribute them

^a Conc. Matiscon. II. c. vi. Quæcumque reliquæ sacrificiorum post peractam missam in sacrario supersederint, quarta vel sexta feria innocentes ab illo, cujus interest, ad ecclesiam adducantur, et indicto eis jejunio, easdem reliquias conspersas vino percipiant. (v. 982.)

^b Evagr. lib. iv. c. xxxvi. Vales. ii. p. 410. “Εθος παλαιὸν βούλεται ἀπὸ τὴν βασιλεύουσας, ὅτ’ ἂν πολὺ τι χρῆμα τῶν ἁγίων μερίδων τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἱναπομῖναι, παῖδας ἀφθόρους μιτακίμπτους γίγνισθαι παρὰ τῶν ἐς χαμαιδιδασκάλους φοιτῶντων, καὶ ταῦτα κατισθίειν ὅτι ἐπιδοὺ γίγνισιν, ἡλίσθη μὲτὰ τῶν παίδων ὑαλουργῶ παῖς, Ἐβραίου τὴν δόξαν ἐς τοῖς γονεῦσι τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς βραδυτῆτος συνθανομένοις, ἀνίστη τὸ γιγνόν, καὶ ὅτι ἐπεὶ ἀποφαγὼν τὸν τοῖς ἄλλοις παισὶν εἶη ὁ δὲ φύσας, θυμωθεὶς καὶ μνήσας, ἐν τῇ πνιγῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἴδω τὴν ὑαλον ἰσθῶν, τὸν παῖδα καθίσιν ἀνάψας ὡς δὲ τὸν παῖδα ἡ μήτηρ ζῆτωσα, ὑπὲρ οὐκ ἰσχυρῇ πεινῶν τῆς πύλης ἢ ποτιωμένη, καὶ λύγιον κοκκύουσα καὶ εἰς αἰτία παρὰ τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἐργαστηρίου τάνδρος ἰσθῶσα, ὀνομαστὶ ἀνιπάλυ τὸν παῖδα, τοῖς θρηνοῖς σπαραττομένη ὁ δὲ, τῆς φωνῆς τῆς μητρὸς συνίς, ἐκ τοῦ πνιγῆς ἀνταπικρίνιστο ἡ δὲ, τὰς θύρας διατιμῶσα, ἴσω τι γινομένη, ἐρᾷ τὸν παῖδα τῶν ἀνθρώπων μίσει ἰσθῶσα, τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτὸν μὴ προσάψαντος ἐς ἀνθρωπίνους, ὥς ἀπαθὲς μιμνήσκῃ, γυναικῇ ἔφη περφυρᾷ ἀμπεχομένη ἰσθῶσα συχρὰ φοιτῶσαν παρ’ αὐτὸν, ὕδαρ ὀρίγῃ, καὶ τούτῳ τοὺς πλησιάζοντας τῶν ἀνθρώπων κατινιάζειν, σιτίζῃν τι αὐτὸν ὁσάκις πεινῶν ὅτι ἐπιδοὺ ἐς Ἰουστινιανὸν ἡνίχθη, τὸν μὲν παῖδα καὶ τὴν μητέρα τῇ λουτρῇ τῆς καλιγγινισίας φωτισθέντας ἐκλήρωσι τὸν δὲ φύσαντα, οὐκ ἀνασχόμενον Χριστιανῶς ἱναριθμηθῆναι, ἐν συνκαῖς ὡς παιδοφόνον ἀνισκολόπισι.

among them.” And he tells this remarkable story upon it, “That the son of a certain Jew happening one day to be among them, and acquainting his father what he had done, his father was so enraged at the thing, that he cast him into his burning furnace, where he was used to make glass. But the boy was preserved untouched for some days, till his mother found him: and the matter being related to Justinian, the emperor, he ordered the mother and the child to be baptized; and the father, because he refused to become a Christian, to be crucified as the murderer of his son.” The same thing is related by Gregory of Tours,¹ and Nicephorus Callistus;² who also adds, that the custom continued at Constantinople to his own time, that is, the middle of the fourteenth century; for he says, “When he was a child, he was often called to partake of the remains of the sacrament, after this manner, among other children.”

SECT. V.—*And sometimes burned in the Fire.*

In some places they observed the rule, given by God for disposing of the remainders of the sacrifices of peace-offerings and vows under the old law; which was to burn them with fire (Lev. vii. 17). This was the custom of the Church of Jerusalem in the fifth century, when Hesychius, a presbyter of that Church, wrote his comment upon Leviticus, where he speaks of it in these words:³ “God commanded the remainder of the flesh and the bread to be burned with fire. And we now see with our own eyes the same thing done in the church: whatever happens to remain of the eucharist unconsumed, we immediately burn with fire, and that not after one, two, or many days.” From hence our learned writers generally observe two things:⁴ 1. That it was not

¹ Gregor. Turon. de Glor. Martyr. lib. l. c. x. tot. (Bibl. Patr. Max. tom. xi. pp. 833, 834, edit. Lugd. 1677.)

² Niceph. lib. xvii. c. xxv. tot.

³ Hesych. in Levit. lib. ii. ap. Albertin. de Euchar. p. 851, b. Quod reliquum est de carnibus et panibus, in igne incendi præcepit (Deus). Quod nunc videmus sensibilibiter etiam in ecclesia fieri, ignique tradi, quæcumque remanere contigerint inconsumta, non omnino ea, quæ una die vel duabus aut multis servata sunt.

⁴ Vid. Du Moulin, Novelty of Popery, lib. vii. Controv. xi. chap. xix.

the custom of the Church of Jerusalem to reserve the eucharist so much as from one day to another, though they did in some other Churches. 2. That they certainly did not believe it to be the natural body and substance of Christ, but only his typical, or symbolical body. For what a horrible and sacrilegious thing must the very Jews and heathens have thought it for Christians to burn the living and glorified body of their God! And how must it have scandalized simple and plain Christians themselves, to have seen the God they worshipped, burned in the fire! And with what face could they have objected this to the heathen, that they worshipped such things as might be burned (which is the common argument used by Arnobius, Lactantius, Athanasius, and most others), if they themselves had done the same thing? If there were no other argument against transubstantiation and host-worship, this one thing were enough to persuade any rational man, that such doctrines and practices were never countenanced by the ancient Church.

SECT. VI.—*The other Oblations partly disposed of in a Feast of Charity. Which all the Ancients reckon an Apostolical Rite accompanying the Communion.*

We have seen how they disposed of the consecrated elements: and are next to examine what they did with their other oblations. It has been already observed, that some part of these (by what distinction made, is not very easy to tell) went toward the maintenance of the clergy. Out of the rest a common entertainment was usually made, which, from the nature and circumstances of it, was usually called *agape*, or ‘feast of charity;’^m because it was a liberal

(p. 1237, tot. edit. German. Wesel, 1632, 4to.) — Albertin. de Sacram. Euchar. lib. ii. p. 853, a. Quantum enim offendiculum Judæis et ethnicis fuisset, si Christianos rescivissent Christi Dei sui corpus animatum et gloriosum ignibus tradere? . . . Sed quid urgeo scandalum Judæorum et paganorum? Simples certe Christiani id tamquam horrendum abominati fuissent.

^m Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. n. viii. Οὐκ ἔξ ἴσσι χωρὶς τοῦ ἱερισμοῦ, οὔτε βαπτίζουσιν, οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιῶν. Epistola interpolata vocat id δαχὴν. — Constitut. lib. ii. c. xxviii. Τοῖς εἰς ἀγάπην, ἤτοι δαχὴν, ὡς ὁ Κύριος ἀνάμασι, περισσευόμενος καλῶν προσευτῆρας, ἣν ἐπίστανται οἱ διάκονοι θλιβομένην. αὐτῇ πλειστάκις συμμετέσχουσιν, κ. τ. λ. — Clement. Alex. Pædag. lib. ii. c. i. p. 165, 15. Τὰ γὰρ βρώματα

collation of the rich to feed the poor. St. Chrysostom gives this account of it, deriving it from apostolical practice: he says,ⁿ “The first Christians had all things in common, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles; and when that ceased, as it did in the apostles’ time, this came in its room, as an efflux, or imitation of it. For though the rich did not make all their substance common, yet upon certain days appointed they made a common table: and when their service was ended, and they had all communicated in the holy mysteries, they all met at a common feast; the rich bringing provisions; and the poor, and those who had nothing, being invited, they all feasted in common together.” In another place, he repeats the same thing, saying,^o “From this law and custom [of having all things common] there arose then another admirable custom in the Churches. For when all the faithful met together, and had heard the sermon and prayers, and received the communion, they did not immediately return home, upon the breaking up of the assembly;

τῇ κοιλίᾳ, ἐξ ᾧν ὁ σαρκικὸς ὄντως οὕτως καὶ φθοροποιὸς ἀπὸληται βίος· ὃν ἀγάπην τινὲς τολμῶσι καλεῖν, ἀθύρῃ γλώττῃ κίχρημένοι, διωπνέοντι τινα, κνίσσης καὶ ζωμῶν ἀποπνέοντα· τὸ καλὸν καὶ σωτήριον ἔργον τοῦ Λόγου, τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν ἡγιασμένην, κυβητοῖσι καὶ ζωμῶν ῥύσι καθευρίζοντι, κ. τ. λ.

ⁿ Chrysostom. Hom. xxvii. in 1 Cor. p. 559, (p. 289, edit. Francof.) Καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν τρισχιλίων τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πιστευσάντων κοινῇ πάντες ἐστίαντο, καὶ κοινὰ πάντα ἐκίκτηντο, οὕτω καὶ τότε ταῦτα ἔγραψεν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἵναίτη, οὐχ οὕτω μὲν μιστὰ ἀκριβοῖας· ὅσπερ δὲ τις ἀπόρροια τῆς κοινωνίας ἐκείνης ἱναπομείνασα, καὶ εἰς τοὺς μιστὰ ταῦτα κατέβη· καὶ ἰσὶδῇ συνέβαιναι, τοὺς μὲν πίνοντας εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ πλουσίους, τὰ μὲν ἑαυτῶν οὐ κατετίθεντο πάντα εἰς μίσην, κοινὰς δὲ ἱποιοῦντο τὰς τραπέζας ἐν ἡμέραις νομισμέναις, ὡς εἰκός· καὶ τῆς συνάξεως ἀπαρτισθείσης μιστὰ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν ἐπὶ κοινὴν πάντες ἦσαν εὐωχίας, τῶν μὲν πλουτούντων φερόντων τὰ ἰδίματτα, τῶν δὲ πτωχῶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἔχόντων ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν καλουμένων καὶ κοινῇ πάντων ἐστιασμένων.

^o Ibid. Hom. xxii. Oportet hæreses esse, &c. tom. v. p. 310, C. (p. 280, edit. Francof.) Ἐκ τούτου τοῖνυν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ ἔθους ἵναίτη τις συνήθεια θαυμαστὴ τότε ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· συνιόντες γὰρ οἱ πιστοὶ πάντες μιστὰ τὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀκρόασιν, μιστὰ τὰς εὐχὰς, μιστὰ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν, τῆς συνάξεως λυθίσσης οὐκ ἀνιχθῆναι εὐθὺς οἰκαδὶ, ἀλλ’ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ ὑποτάκτοι φέροντες οἴκῳ τροφὰς καὶ ἰδίματτα, τοὺς πίνοντας ἐκάλουν, καὶ κοινὰς ἱποιοῦντο τραπέζας, κοινὰς ἐστίας, κοινὰ συμπόσια ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ὅστι καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς κατὰ τὴν τράπεζαν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου, καὶ πανταχόθεν τὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῖς ἐπισφίγγισθαι, καὶ πολλὴν μὲν τὴν ἡδονήν, πολλὴν δὲ αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι τὴν ὠφελίαν· οἳ τε γὰρ πίνοντες παραμυθίας ἀπίλυνον οὐ τῆς τυχεύσεως, καὶ οἱ πλουτούντες πολλὴν εὐνοίαν καὶ παρὰ τῶν τριφορέων, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι’ ὃν ταῦτα ἱποιοῦν, κατεψωσάμενοι πολλὴν τὴν χάριν, οὕτως ἀνήσαν οἰκαδὶ.

but the rich and wealthy brought meat and food from their own houses; and called the poor, and made a common table, a common dinner, a common banquet in the church. And so from this fellowship in eating, and the reverence of the place, they were all strictly united in charity, one with another, and much pleasure and profit arose thence to them all: for the poor were comforted, and the rich reaped the fruits of their benevolence, both from those whom they fed, and from God." The same account is given by the author under the name of St. Jerom, who says,^p "When they met in the church, they made their oblations separately; and, after the communion, whatever remained of those sacrifices, they ate and consumed in a common supper together." The like is said by Theodoret,^q Œcumenius, Theophylact, and others, upon that place of the apostle. From whence it appears that this was a rite always accompanying the communion. And it is a singular opinion of Albaspinæus,^r when he asserts that these *agapæ* and the communion were never celebrated at the same time; which he maintains, without any foundation, against the concurrent sense both of ancient and modern writers.

^p Hieron. in 1 Cor. xi. 20. In ecclesia convenientes oblationes suas separatim offerebant, et post communionem, quæcumque eis de sacrificiis superfuissent, illic in ecclesia communem cœnam comedentes pariter consumeabant.

^q Theodoret. in 1 Cor. xi. 16, Hal. 1771, vol. iii. p. 237. Εἰώθασαν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, μετὰ τὴν μυστικὴν λειτουργίαν, ἐστιάσθαι κοινῇ πλούσιοι τε καὶ πίνησις· καὶ πολλὰ ἐνταῦθεν παραμυθία τοῖς πτωχομένοις ἐγίνετο· τῶν μὲν εὐπόρων οἰκοῦν τὰ ἐξώγια κομιζόντων, τῶν δὲ πεινῶν συζώντων, διὰ τὴν μετουσίαν τῆς πίστεως κοινωνούντων τῆς εὐχαρίας. — Œcumen. in 1 Cor. xi. tom. i. p. 529, (cit. Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. i. sect. iv.) Præcipuis diebus, sive festis, post sacrorum mysteriorum participationem agebantur communes cœnæ, præparantibus illas divitibus ac pauperes invitantibus. — Theophyl. in 1 Cor. xi. 17. "Ὁσαυτὲ οἱ ἐν ἀρχῇ πιστεύσαντες, κοινὰ πάντα ἔχοντες κοινῇ ἐστιάωντο· οὕτω κατὰ τινα μίμησιν τούτων, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀκριβῆ, ἐν Κορίνθῳ κατὰ τινὰς ἡμέρας, ἑορτίους ἴσως, κοινῇ εὐχαρῶντο μετὰ τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῶν μυστηρίων.

^r Albaspin. (Observat. lib. i. c. xviii. p. 57, observante Suicero,) p. 26, tom. i. probare conatur, agapas diebus Dominicis fuisse celebratas, eucharistiam vero post agapas illas non fuisse celebratam, quia agapæ cœna fuerit, quæ tantum vesperi facta: eucharistiam vero non nisi mane sumtam fuisse, etsi Dominus eam sub vesperam instituerit. In agapis numquam celebratam fuisse eucharistiam, &c.

SECT. VII.—*Whether this Feast was before or after the Communion, in the Apostles' Days.*

There is some difference, indeed, between the ancient and modern interpreters, concerning one circumstance of these love-feasts, in point of time, as practised in the apostles' days. The ancients, as we have heard already out of St. Chrysostom and the rest, generally say, "These feasts were not till after the communion, when the whole ceremony of preaching, praying, and participating of the sacred elements was over, and the remainders of the oblations were to be disposed of." But many of the moderns think otherwise: Dr. Cave says,^s it is probable that, in the apostles' time, and the age after them, this feast was before the communion, in imitation of our Saviour's institution, who celebrated the sacrament after supper; and St. Paul taxing the abuses of the Church of Corinth, reproves them, that when they came together for the Lord's supper, they did not tarry one for another, but every one took his own supper, and one was hungry, and another was drunken. All this, he says, must needs be done before the celebration of the eucharist, which was never administered till the whole Church met together. In this opinion, he has the concurrence of Suicerus,^t and

^s Cave, Prim. Christ. part. i. c. xi. p. 344. Whether this banquet was before or after the celebration of the eucharist, is not easy to determine: it is probable, that, in the apostles' time, and the age after them, it was before it, in imitation of our Saviour's institution, who celebrated the sacrament after supper. And St. Paul, taxing the abuses of the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. xi.) that 'when they came together for the Lord's Supper, they did not tarry one for another, but every one took his own supper;' i. e. that provision which he had brought from home for the common feast, which was devoured with great irregularity and excess; some eating and drinking all they brought; others (the poor especially that came late) having nothing left, 'one being hungry, and another drunken,' &c.

^t Suicer. Thes. Eccles. voce 'Αγάπη, (tom. i. p. 24.) Eucharistiam demum post ἀγάπης illas fuisse celebratam, ex 1 ad Cor. c. xi. satis manifestum est. Ibi enim apostolus κυριανὸν δῶπνον eorum vocat, qui conveniebant ad commune convivium in ecclesia agitandum. In quo non aliud reprehendit, quam quod unusquisque propriam prius sumebat cœnam edendo, adeo ut alii quidem esurirent, alii vero ebrii essent. "ἕκαστος τὸ ἴδιον δῶπνον προλαμβάνει. Ex quibus verbis patet, eos prius cœnasse, deinde eucharistiam in illis conviviiis sumsisse.

Daillé,^u and Estius,^{*} who says that Pelagius, Primasius, Haimo, Hervæus, Aquinas, Lyra, Cajetan, and others of the Latins, were of the same opinion. That which seems most probable, is, that they observed no certain rule about this matter, but had their feasts sometimes before, sometimes after the communion; as it appears to have been in some measure in the following ages.

^u Dall. de Objecto Cult. Relig. lib. ii. c. xix. p. 292. De eo uno lis aliqua est, an illam piorum communem agapen, sive cœnam, præcesserit, an vero sequuta sit, sacramenti ipsius participatio. . . . Eam (sententiam, qua præcessisse dicitur 'agape') Estius, qui præfert, multis rationibus confirmat, &c.

^{*} Estius, in 1 Cor. xi. 20. Longe probabilius est id, quod Augustinus insinuat in epistola ad Januarium: morem fuisse, ut prius haberetur convivium illud commune; postea fieret oblatio et participatio sacræ eucharistiæ. Quamvis enim opinetur Augustinus, Corinthios per abusum mensis suis sacra miscuisse, tamen ut certo anni tempore post alios cibos eucharistia sumeretur a fidelibus, eum morem ad rationabilia majorum refert instituta. Quod autem hoc ordine res facta fuerit in cœtibus primitivorum fidelium, inprimis ea ratio suadet, quod, uti dictum est, illa cœna, quam Paulus vocat Dominicam, representatio fuerit cœnæ Domini cum apostolis, et inde nomen acceperit; unde consentaneum est, ut insignior esset commemoratio (quomodo loquitur ibidem Augustinus), celebratam fuisse eodem ordine, quo Christus suam cum discipulis cœnam celebravit. Quem profecto constat prius cœnasse cum discipulis; ac deinde corporis ac sanguinis sui sacramenta eis tradidisse. Præterea dicit apostolus, aliquos præsumere cœnam, aliis non expectatis. Quod utique non fieret, si (quod Græci volunt) omnes jam ante congregati eucharistiam accepissent. Ex quo satis intelligitur, convivium illud haberi solitum in principio, velut primum actum illius conventus fidelium, de quo heic agitur. Idem plane ex iis apparet, quæ mox subjiciuntur de indigna sumtione corporis ac sanguinis Domini: deque probatione ante sumtionem necessaria. Nam hæc locum non haberent, si convivium et quæ in eo peccata erant, facta fuissent post sumtam eucharistiam. Neque enim judicatur quis indigne sumsisse, propter peccata postea commissa. Denique hanc sententiam confirmat ea consuetudo, quæ usque ad Augustini tempora in multis ecclesiis observata fuit, ut in anniversario die cœnæ Domini, mysteria a non jejunis sumerentur, videlicet ad imitationem et commemorationem ejus, quod in illa cœna factum fuerit. Meminit illius consuetudinis Concilium Carthaginense tertium canone xxix. Cui concilio beatum Augustinum interfuisse prodit ipsius epistola cccxxxiii. Canon autem sic habet, 'Ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur, excepto uno die anniversario, quo cœna Domini celebratur.' Sentiunt cum Augustino, quoad ordinem memoratum, commentatores hujus loci Pelagius, Primasius, Sedulius, Haimo, Hervæus, Aquinas, Lyranus, Cajetanus, atque alii Latini; tametsi eorum nonnulli, nominatim Petrus Lombardus, etiam alterius ordinis ac sensus meminerunt.

SECT. VIII.—*How observed in the following Ages. The Eucharist commonly received fasting, and before this Feast, except upon some particular Occasions.*

For when the Christians, in time of persecution, were obliged to meet early in the morning, before day, to celebrate the eucharist in their religious assemblies; then their feasting before communion could not well comport with the circumstances and occasion of their meeting. And therefore, in the beginning of the second century, we find the eucharist was received before, and the feast postponed. For so Pliny^y represents it in the account which he had from the Christians in the entrance of this century: for having said, “That they met on the Lord’s day to sing hymns to Christ, and bind themselves by a sacrament;” it is added, “When this is done, our custom is to depart, and meet again to partake of an entertainment, but that a very innocent one, and common to all.” It is plain here the communion was first, and the *agape* some time after. And so Tertullian, who gives the most particular account of it, speaks of it as a supper a little before night:^z “Our supper, which you accuse of luxury, shews its reason in its very name: for it is called *ἀγάπη*, which signifies ‘love,’ among the Greeks. Whatever charge we are at, it is gain to be at the expense upon the account of piety. For we therewith relieve and refresh the poor. There is nothing vile or immodest committed in it. For we do not sit down before we have first offered up

^y Plin. lib. x. Ep. xcvii. Quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, adfirmabant, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium.

^z Tertul. Apol. c. xxxix. p. 32, A. Cœna nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit: id vocatur *ἀγάπη*, quod *dilectio* penes Græcos. Quantiscumque sumptibus constet, lucrum est pietatis nomine facere sumtum. Siquidem inopes refrigerio isto juvamus. . . . Nihil vilitatis, nihil immodestiæ admittit. Non prius discumbitur, quam oratio ad Deum prægustetur. Editur quantum esurientes cupiunt: bibitur, quantum pudicis est utile. Ita saturantur, ut qui meminerint etiam per noctem adorandum Deum sibi esse. Ita fabulantur, ut qui sciant, Dominum audire. Post aquam manualet et lumina, ut quisque de Scripturis Sanctis vel de proprio ingenio potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere: hinc probatur, quomodo biberit. Aequè oratio convivium dirimit: inde disceditur non in catervas cætionum, neque in classes discursationum, nec in eruptiones lasciviarum, sed ad eandem curam modestiæ et pudicitæ; ut qui non tam cœnam cœnaverint, quam disciplinam.

prayer to God. We eat only to satisfy hunger ; and drink only so much as becomes modest persons. We fill ourselves in such manner, as that we remember still that we are to worship God by night. We discourse as in the presence of God, knowing that he hears us. Then after water to wash our hands, and lights brought in, every one is moved to sing some hymn to God, either out of Scripture, or, as he is able, of his own composing : and by this we judge whether he has observed the rules of temperance in drinking. Prayer again concludes our feast ; and thence we depart, not to fight and quarrel ; not to run about and abuse all we meet, not to give ourselves up to lascivious pastime ; but to pursue the same care of modesty and chastity, as men that have fed at a supper of philosophy and discipline, rather than a corporeal feast.” As this is a fine description of these holy banquets, where charity is the foundation, and prayer begins and ends the feast, and singing of hymns and religious discourses season the entertainment, and modesty and temperance runs through the whole ; so the particular mention made of lights, and worshipping God by night, shews that they came after the communion, and not before, in Tertullian’s time ; when they were used to receive the communion in the morning, and always fasting, even upon those days when they deferred it till three in the afternoon, as upon the stationary days, or till six at night. For it was a rule, in the African Church, to receive the eucharist fasting at all times, except one day, which was the Thursday before Easter, commonly called *cæna Domini*, because it was the day on which our Saviour celebrated his last supper, and instituted the eucharist after supper : in imitation of which, it was the custom to celebrate the eucharist after supper on this day, in the African Churches, but on no other day whatsoever ; as we learn from the third Council of Carthage and St. Austin. The Council of Carthage had an express canon to this purpose :* “That the sacrament of the altar be never celebrated by any but such as are fasting, except

* Conc. Carth. III. c. xxix. Ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur, excepto uno die anniversario, quo cæna Domini celebratur. (ii. 1171.)

on one anniversary day, when the supper of the Lord is solemnized." And, pursuant to this, they order, that if any commendation of the dead was to be made in the afternoon, it should only be done with prayers, and not with the celebration of the eucharist, if they that assisted at the funeral office, had dined before. St. Austin was a member of this council; and he assures us, that this decree was conformable to the practice of the universal Church in his age, which he thought to be derived from the appointment of the apostles. For though it be very apparent, that when the disciples first received the body and blood of the Lord, they did not receive fasting; yet does any one now accuse the universal Church, because all men receive fasting?^b For so it pleased the Holy Ghost, that, for the honour of so great a sacrament, the Lord's body should enter into the mouth of a

^b Aug. Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. cc. vi. vii. Liquido apparet quando primum acceperunt discipuli corpus et sanguinem Domini, non eos accepisse jejunos. Num quid tamen propterea calumniandum est universæ ecclesiæ, quod a jejuniis semper accipitur? Ex hoc enim placuit Spiritui Sancto, ut in honorem tanti sacramenti in os Christiani prius Dominicum corpus intraret, quam [exteri] ceteri cibi: nam ideo per universum orbem mos iste servatur. Neque enim quia post cibos dedit Dominus, propterea pransi aut cœnati fratres ad illud sacramentum accipiendum convenire debent, aut sicut faciebant, quos apostolus arguit et emendat, mensis suis ista miscere. Namque Salvator, quo vehementius commendaret mysterii illius altitudinem, ultimum hoc voluit altius infigere cordibus et memoriæ discipulorum; a quibus ad passionem digressurus erat. Et ideo non præcepit, quo deinceps ordine sumeretur, ut apostolis, per quos ecclesias dispositurus erat, servaret hunc locum. Nam si hoc ille monuisset, ut post cibos alios semper acciperetur, credo quod eum morem nemo variasset. Quum vero ait apostolus de hoc sacramento loquens, 'Propter quod, fratres, quum conveneritis ad manducandum, invicem expectate: si quis esurit, domi manducet, ut non ad iudicium conveniatis:' statim subtexit, 'Cetera autem, quum venero, ordinabo:' 1 Cor. xi. 34. Unde intelligi datur (quia multum erat, ut in epistola totum illum agendi ordinem insinuaret, quem universa per orbem servat ecclesia), ab ipso ordinatum esse, quod nulla morum diversitate variatur. . . . Sed nonnullos probabilis quædam ratio delectavit, ut uno certo die per annum, quo ipsam cœnam Dominus dedit, tamquam ad insigniorem commemorationem, post cibos offerri et accipi liceat corpus et sanguinem Domini. Honestius autem arbitror ea hora fieri, ut qui etiam jejunaverit, post refectionem, quæ hora nona fit, ad oblationem possit occurrere. Qua propter neminem cogimus ante Dominicam illam cœnam prandere, sed nulli etiam contradicere audemus. Hoc tamen non arbitror institutum, nisi quia plures et prope omnes in plerisque locis eo die cœnare [lavare?] consueverunt. Et quia nonnulli etiam jejunium custodiunt, mane Christo propter prandentes, quia jejunia simul et lavacra tolerare non possunt; ad vesperam vero propter jejunantes. (Antwerp. 1700, ii. 95, F.)

Christian before any other food. And, therefore, this custom is observed by the whole world. For neither because the Lord gave it after meat, ought the brethren to meet after dinner or supper to receive it, or to imitate those whom the apostle reproves and corrects, who mingled it with their tables. Our Saviour, to commend the greatness of this mystery, was minded, indeed, to fix it in the hearts and memory of his disciples as the last thing, before he went from them to his passion: but he did not therefore order in what manner it should be received, that he might reserve this for his apostles to do, by whom he intended to order his Church. For if he had appointed, that men should receive it after meat, I suppose no one would have altered that custom. But when the apostle, speaking of this sacrament, says, "The rest will I set in order when I come" (1 Cor. xi. 34), we are given to understand, that he then appointed this custom of receiving fasting, which now the whole Church, over all the world, observes without any variation or diversity. But Austin adds, that some, upon a probable reason, were delighted to offer and receive the body of the Lord, after meat, on one certain day in the year, when the Lord himself gave his supper, to make the commemoration of it more remarkable. And because some, on that day, chose to fast, and others not, therefore, in many places, it was customary to offer the sacrifice twice, to serve the ends of both.—St. Chrysostom also frequently speaks of their receiving the communion fasting.^c "Thou fastest," says he, "before thou receivest the eucharist, that thou mayest be worthy." And, in one or two places, he vindicates himself from an objection which his adversaries brought against him, as if he was used to transgress this rule, both in administering baptism and the eucharist. They say,^d "I gave the communion

^c Chrysostom. Hom. xxvii. in 1 Cor. p. 567, (p. 297, edit. Francof.) *ὡς δὲ πρὶν ἢ μὴν μεταλαβεῖν τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ἵνα ὅπως δέῃται ἄξιος φανῇ τῆς κοινωνίας.*

^d Ibid. Epist. cxv. ad Cyriacum, tom. iv. p. 868, B. (p. 760, edit. cit.) *Λίγουσι, ὅτι τινὰς ἐκοινώνησα μετὰ τὸ φαγεῖν αὐτοὺς. καὶ εἰ μὴν τοῦτο ἐποίησα, ἐκαλυφθὲν τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, καὶ μὴ γραφίῃ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς ὁδοδόξου πίστεως, ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἰὰν τοιοῦτον ἐγὼ ἱστέα, καὶ ἀπαλαλῶμι Χριστὸς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ· εἰ δὲ ἄπαξ καὶ τοῦτό μοι λίγουσι, καὶ φιλονικεῖσι, καθιλύσαντες καὶ τὸν Παῦλον, ὃς μετὰ τὸ διαπῆσαι ὁλόκληρον τὸν οἶκον ἰσάπται· καθιλύσαντες καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον, ὃς μετὰ τὸ διαπῆσαι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τὴν κοινωνίαν ἰδοὺ.*

to some after eating. If I have done this, let my name be wiped out of the catalogue of bishops, and not be written in the book of the orthodox faith. If I have done any such thing, let Christ cast me out of his kingdom. But if they still go on to object this, let them also degrade St. Paul, who baptized a whole house after supper. Let them also depose the Lord himself, who gave the communion to his apostles after supper." So again,^e "They object against me, 'Thou didst first eat, and then administer baptism.' If I did so, let me be anathema; let me not be numbered in the roll of bishops; let me not be among the angels; let me never please God. But if I had done so, what absurdity had I committed? Let them depose Paul, who baptized the jailor after supper. Yea, I will say a bolder thing, Let them depose Christ himself, for he gave the communion to his disciples after supper." This shews the custom of the Church was to administer both sacraments before eating; though, at the same time, it intimates, that to do otherwise was not an unpardonable crime. Gregory Nazianzen hints also at this custom, when he says,^f "Every action of Christ is not necessary to be imitated by us: for he celebrated the mystery of the Passover, with his disciples, in an upper room, and after supper; but we do it in the church, and before supper." The like is said by St. Basil,^g and many other of the Greek writers. And, among the Latins, there are several canons of the Councils of Braga,^h

^e Chrysostom. Serm. antequam iret in Exilium, tom. iv. p. 966, C. (p. 845, edit. Francof.) Λίγουσί μοι ὅτι ἔφαγες καὶ ἐβάπτισας. εἰ ἐποίησα τοῦτο, ἀνάθιμα ἱερωματὶ μὴ ἀρειμνηθῆναι εἰς ἐπισκοπῶν ῥίζαν· μὴ γίνωμαι μετ' ἀγγέλων· μὴ ἐρίσω Θεῷ. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐβάπτισα, οὐδὲν ἄκαιρον τῶν πραγμάτων ἐποίησα. . . . Καθελίττωσαν οὖν Παῦλον, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ διαπῆσαι ἔχαρίσατο τῷ διαμαφύλακί τὸ βάπτισμα. σολμῶ λίγην, καθελίττωσαν καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ δῶναι τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὴν κοινωνίαν ἔχαρίσατο.

^f Nazianz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 659, D. Πάλιν μυσταγωγῶ τὸ πάσχα τοῦς μαθητὰς ἐν ὑπερώῳ καὶ μετὰ δῶναι, καὶ πρὸ μῶς τοῦ παλίν ἡμέρας, ἡμεῖς ἐν προσηυχῇ οἴκοι καὶ πρὸ τοῦ δῶναι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν.

^g Basil. Hom. de Jejuniis, (tom. i. p. 280, d.) Οὐ δυνατὸν ἄνθρωπον νηστίας ἱερουργίας κατατολμῆσαι.

^h Conc. Bracar. I. c. xvi. (Labbe. Conc. ii. c. xvi. tom. v. p. 838.) Si quis quinta feria paschali, quæ vocatur cœna Domini, hora legitima, post nonam jejuniis in ecclesia missas non tenet, sed, secundum sectam Priscilliani, festivitatem ipsius Dei, ab hora tertia, per missas defunctorum, soluto jejuniis colit, anathema sit. — Bracar. II. c. x. (Labbe. Conc. iii. c. x. v. p. 898.) Placuit, ut quia per

Mascon,¹ Auxerre,¹ and Toledo,¹ to this purpose. Some of which allow the African custom of communicating after eating, on the Thursday in Passion-week; but others upon the account of the Priscillianists, forbid it. And, therefore, Socrates^m notes it as a singular thing in the churches of Egypt and Thebais, that on Saturdays, they were used to administer the eucharist, after eating in the evening. Which is prohibited by the Council of Trullo,ⁿ not excepting the Thursday in Passion-week, which though the African fathers, for probable reasons, might allow, yet they utterly forbid it. By all which it appears, that the general custom of the Church was to celebrate the eucharist fasting: and, consequently, that these love-feasts we are speaking of, must be held after the communion, and not before it. Yet it is but a sorry argument in Mabillon^o to conclude hence that

stultitiam præsumpti nuper erroris, aut certe ex veteris Priscillianæ adhuc hæresis fœtore, corruptos cognovimus quosdam presbyteros in hujus præsumptionis audacia detineri, ut in missa mortuorum etiam post acceptum merum, oblationem ausi sunt consecrare; ideoque hoc præfixe evidentis sententiæ admonitione servetur, ut si quis presbyter post hoc edictum nostrum amplius in hac vesania fuerit deprehensus, id est, ut non jejunus, sed quocumque jam cibo præcepto, oblationem consecraverit, continuo ab officio suo privatus, a proprio deponatur episcopo.

¹ Conc. Matiscon. II. c. vi. (tom. v. Conc. p. 982.) Decernimus, ut nullus presbyter confertus cibo, aut crapulatus vino, sacrificia contractare, aut missas privatis festisque diebus concelebrare præsumat. Injustum est enim, ut spiritali alimento corporale præponatur: sed si quis hoc attentare curaverit, dignitatem amittat honoris.

¹ Conc. Antissiod. c. xix. (ibid. p. 959.) Non licet presbytero, aut diacono, aut subdiacono, post acceptum cibum vel poculum missas tractare.

¹ Conc. Tolet. VII. c. ii. (ibid. p. 1839.) Ne, quod naturæ languoris causa consulitur, in præsumptionis perniciem convertatur, nullus post cibum potumve quamlibet minimum sumtum missas facere, &c.

^m Socrat. lib. v. c. xxii. Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ γίτοις ὄντις Ἀλεξανδρίαν, καὶ οἱ τὴν Θεαλεῖα οἰκοῦντες, ἐν σαββάτῳ μὲν ποιῶνται συνάξεις· οὐχ ὡς Ἰβὼς δὲ Χριστιανῶς τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσι· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ὑψωθῆναι, καὶ παντοίων ἰδεσμάτων ἐμφορῆσθαι, περὶ ἰστίαν προσφίροντες, τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσι. (Val. 235.)

ⁿ Conc. Trul. c. xxix. (vi. 1155.) Ὁ τῶν ἐν Καρθαγίνῃ διαγορεύει κανὼν, ὅστις τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου θυσιαστηρίου εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ νηστικῶν ἀνθρώπων μὴ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἐξηρημίνης μῶς ἡσυχίας ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ τὸ κυριακὸν δῶπαν ἐπιτελεῖται· ἵσως τηλικαῦτα διὰ τινος κατὰ τοὺς τόπους προφάσεως τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ λυσιτελεῖς, τῶν θείων ἐκείνων πατέρων τῇ τοιαύτῃ χηρσαμένον οἰκονομίᾳ· μηδὲν οὖν ἡμῶς ἐνάγοντος καταλασιῖν τὴν ἀρεσίαν, ἐρίζομεν ἀποστολικαῖς καὶ πατρικαῖς ἐπέμνοι παραδόσεις, μὴ δεῖν ἐν τῇ τισσαρεκστῇ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ ἰδομάδι τὴν τίμωπτην λύειν, καὶ ἔλιν τὴν τισσαρεκστὴν ἀνιμάζειν.

^o Mabillon. de Liturg. Gallic. lib. i. c. vi. n. vii. p. 61. Qui potuit tanta religio officere majores nostros in suscipiendo eucharistiæ sacramento, si solam cor-

the ancients must needs believe transubstantiation, because they received the communion fasting. For he might as reasonably have concluded from Chrysostom, that the water in baptism was transubstantiated, because we have heard him say before, that they always administered baptism fasting. And some learned men are of opinion,^p that for the three first ages, though they generally received the eucharist fasting in the assemblies before day, yet sometimes they received after supper. For Cyprian, disputing against the Aquarians, who celebrated, in the morning, in water only; and, in the evening, in wine and water mixed together; does not contend with them about celebrating after supper, but only because they did not at both times mix wine with water, after Christ's example. He would not so easily have passed over the practice of the Aquarians, in celebrating in the evening, had there been no instances of the like practice in the Church: but as it was customary in Egypt to celebrate the eucharist on Saturdays, after dinner; and, in Afric, one day in a year after supper; all he pleads for upon this point, is only this,^q that the general custom of

poris Christi in eo figuram, hoc est, nudum panem ac merum vinum residere credidissent?

^p Vid. Dall. de Objecto Cult. Relig. lib. ii. c. xix. p. 297. Ex his patet, totis tribus primis Christianismi sæculis, tametsi in matutinis fraternitatis conventibus, et seorsum in ædibus quoque privatis, sacramentum mane sumi soleret; apud ecclesiam tamen usitatum fuisse, ut id etiam a cœnatis sumeretur, maxime in sancta agaparum lætitia. — Fell. Not. in Cyprian. Epist. lxiii. p. 156, (p. 277, edit. Amstelod.) Constat, eucharistiam licet horis antelucanis sumtam, vespere etiam distribui solitam; cujus rei locuples testis Tertullianus (lib. de Corona, c. iii.): 'Eucharistiæ sacramentum tempore victus de præsidentium manu sumimus.' Et alibi monet, ut finitis stationibus sumatur. Consuetudo post cœnam communicandi diu duravit in ecclesia. Socrates enim ait (lib. v. c. xxii.), *Αἱ γύμνασιαι, κ. τ. λ.* — See before, note (^m).

^q Cyprian. Epist. lxiii. ad Cæcil. p. 156, (p. 277, edit. Amstelod.) [Objectio Aquariorum:] An illa sibi aliquis contemplatione blanditur, quòd, etsi mane aqua sola offerri videtur, tamen, quum ad cœnandum venimus, mixtum calicem offerimus? — [Cypriani responsio:] Sed quum cœnamus, ad convivium nostrum plebem convocare non possumus, ut sacramenti veritatem fraternitate omni præsentē celebremus.—[Aquarii porro objiciebant:] At enim non mane, sed post cœnam mixtum calicem obtulit Dominus.—[Cyprianus respondebat:] Numquid ergo Dominicum post cœnam celebrare debemus, ut sic mixtum calicem frequentandis Dominicis offeramus? Christum offerre oportebat circa vespem diei, ut hora ipsa sacrificii ostenderet occasum et vespem mundi. . . . Nos autem resurrectionem Domini mane celebramus.

the Church to celebrate the eucharist in the morning only, was not against the rule of Christ, though he gave it in the evening after supper : because Christ had a particular reason for what he did, which he did not intend should oblige the Church : Christ offered in the evening, to signify the evening, or end, of the world ; but we offer in the morning, to celebrate our Saviour's resurrection.—And he gives another reason why they did not celebrate in the evening generally, as in the morning, because the people could not so well all come together in the evening as in the morning. By which it is plain, in Cyprian's time, there was no absolute rule to forbid communicating after supper, though the practice began generally to be disused, and the common custom was to receive fasting, and at morning-service.

SECT. IX. — *These Love-Feasts, at first, held in the Church : but afterwards forbidden by Orders of Councils.*

There is one thing more to be observed of their love-feasts, that, as they were designed for the promotion of unity and charity, they were commonly held in the Church for the three first centuries, as learned men^r conclude from that canon of the Council of Gangra,^s which was made against the Eustathians, “ If any one despises the feasts of charity which the faithful make, who, for the honour of the Lord, call their brethren to them, and comes not to the invitation, because he contemns them, let him be anathema.” These Eustathians were men who held their meetings in private houses, and despised the Church ; which is the reason of this canon made against them. However such abuses were sometimes committed in these feasts, that the Council of Laodicea, not long after, made a law against having them in

^r Bever. Not. in c. lxxiv. Trull. p. 161. Et quidem eas (agapas), in ipsis ecclesiis celebratas fuisse ex præsentī et Synod. Laod. c. xxviii. patet, quibus illud prohibetur. Non opus est autem, ut illud prohiberetur, quod nunquam factum fuit. — Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. i. p. 27. Et si antea in templis et ecclesiis ex more apostolico celebrari solita essent hujusmodi convivium Christiana, Concilium nihilominus Laodicenum ea removit (c. xxviii.), cujus verba sunt : Οὐ δεῖ, κ. τ. λ. — See below, note (1).

^s Conc. Gangrens. c. xi. (tom. ii. Conc. p. 419.) Εἴ τις καταφρονεῖ τῶν ἐκ πίστεως ἀγάπας ποιοῦντων, καὶ διὰ τιμὴν τοῦ Κυρίου συγκαλούντων τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἰθὺλοι κοινωνεῖν ταῖς κλήσεσι, διὰ τὸ ἱξυσιτιλεῖν τὸ γινόμενον, ἀνάθεμα ἴσται.

the church,^t forbidding any to eat, or spread tables in the house of God, or the church.—And a like decree was made in the third Council of Carthage,^u forbidding the clergy to feast in the church, unless it were by chance, in a journey, for want of other entertainment : and orders are given to restrain the people, as much as might be, from such feasting in the church. But the custom was too inveterate to be rooted out at once : and, therefore, we find by St. Austin's answer to Faustus the Manichee,^v that they were still kept in the church : for whereas Faustus objected two things against them : 1. That they were but the spawn of the Gentile banquets, turned into Christian feasts ; 2. That the Catholics were used to make themselves drunk at them in the Memorials of the martyrs : St. Austin rejects the first charge as a mere calumny, telling him, “ That the end of their *agapæ* was only to feed the poor with flesh, or the fruits of the earth : ” but the second charge he owns in part as true, that the people still held these feasts in the church, and that some excess was committed in them : “ But then,” says he,^x “ there is a great deal of difference between tolerating and approving : we do not approve of drunkenness even in a private house, much less in a church : it is one thing which we are commanded to teach, and another what we are forced to tolerate and endure, till we can correct and amend it.” St. Austin says,^y all kind of feasting in the church was

^t Conc. Lapdic. c. xxviii. Οὐ δὲ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὰς λεγόμενας ἀγάπας ποιῆν, καὶ ἐν τῇ οἴκῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἰσθίειν καὶ ἀκούεσθαι σ τραννύειν.

^u Conc. Carth. III. c. xxx. Ut nulli episcopi vel clerici in ecclesia conviverent, nisi forte transeuntes hospitiorum necessitate illic reficiant : populi etiam ab hujusmodi conviviis, quantum fieri potest, prohibeantur.

^v Ibid. cont. Faust. lib. xx. c. xx. (tom. vi. opp. p. 374, ed. Basil. 1569.) Nec sacrificia eorum vertimus in agapas (es). . . . Agapæ (es) enim nostræ pauperes pascunt sive frugibus, sive carnibus, &c. (Antwerp. viii. p. 246.)

^x Ibid. c. xxi. Qui se in memoriis martyrum inebriant, quomodo a nobis approbari possunt, quum eos, etiamsi in domibus suis id faciant, sana doctrina condemnet ? Sed aliud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus, aliud quod præcipere jubemur, aliud quod emendare præcipimur, et donec emendemus, tolerare compellimur. (247, C.)

^y Aug. Confess. lib. vi. c. ii. (i. 86.) Quum ad memorias sanctorum, sicut in Africa solebat [de matre sua loquitur] pultes et panem et merum attulisset, atque ab ostiario prohiberetur ; ubi hoc episcopum vetuisse cognovit, tam pie atque obedienter amplexa est, ut ipse mirarer, quam facile accusatrix potius consuetudinis suæ quam disceptatrix illius prohibitionis effecta sit. . . . Ubi

prohibited by St. Ambrose, at Milan, with good success : and it was he himself that gave the advice to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, to make the foresaid canon against it,* in hopes to extirpate it, after the example of St. Ambrose. In France it was prohibited by the second Council of Orleans (an. 541).^a Yet, for all this, there were some remains of it in the seventh century, when the Council of Trullo^b was obliged to reinforce the canon of Laodicea against feasting in the church, under pain of excommunication. So difficult a matter was it to extirpate the abuses of ancient custom, without destroying the custom itself, which was innocent in its original, and of so great service to the Christian Church, whilst it continued free from abuses, that it was the envy and admiration of the heathen.

SECT. X.—*How the Christians were at first abused and calumniated by some of the Heathens, but admired and envied by others, upon account of these Feasts of Charity.*

Some, indeed, were maliciously disposed to calumniate and traduce the Christians upon the account of this innocent custom, as guilty of I know not what black designs. Origen says,^c Celsus charged them with holding clancular and seditious cabals upon the score of these *agapæ*, or ‘meetings,’ to shew kindness to one another ; which is also noted by Tertullian in that chapter of his Apology, where he gives^d us that fine description of the Christian feasts, in answer to

comperit a præclaro prædicatore atque antistite pietatis præceptum esse, ista non fieri, nec ab eis qui sobrie facerent, ne ulla occasio se ingurgitandi daretur ebriosis ; et quia illa quasi parentalia superstitioni Gentilium essent simillima, abstinuit se libentissime, &c.

^a Aug. Epist. lxiv. ad Aurelium tot.

^b Conc. Aurel. II. c. xii. (tom. iv. Conc. p. 1781.) Ne quis in ecclesia votum suum cantando, bibendo, vel lasciviendo dissolvat, quia Deus talibus votis irritatur potius quam placetur.

^c Conc. Trul. c. lxxiv. (tom. vi. Conc. p. 1175.) “Οτι οὐ δι’ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὰς λεγομένας ἀγάπας ποιεῖν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἰσθίου, καὶ ἀκκοῦβιτα στρωννύειν· οἱ καὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖν τολμῶντες ἢ παυσάσθωσαν, ἢ ἀφοριζέσθωσαν.

^d Origen. cont. Cels. lib. i. p. 4. Πρῶτον τῷ Κίλσῳ κεφάλαιόν ἐστι, διαβαλεῖν Χριστιανισμὸν, ὡς συνθήκας κρύβδην πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιουμένων Χριστιανῶν, παρὰ τὰ νομισμένα . . . καὶ βούλεται διαβαλεῖν τὴν καλουμένην ἀγάπην Χριστιανῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ κινδύνου ὀφισταμένην. (Cantabr. 1677.)

^e Tertul. Apol. c. xxxix. Cœnulas nostras, præterquam sceleris infames, ut prodigas suggillatis, &c. (P. 32, A.)

this suggestion. Others charged these feasts with the practice of abominable uncleanness. In answer to which Minucius^c tells them, their feasts were not only chaste but sober; for they did not indulge either gluttony or drunkenness, but tempered their mirth with gravity, with chaste discourse, and chaster bodies. Others added that monstrous fable of their feeding upon human flesh, and feasting upon infants' blood; which is mentioned and refuted by all the apologists, — Athenagoras,^f Theophilus,^g Tertullian,^h Minucius,ⁱ Origen,^k Justin Martyr,^l and many others, whom

^c Minuc. Octav. p. 92, (p. 121, edit. Halens. 1699.) De incesto convivio fabulam grandem adversum nos dæmonum coitio mentita est. At nos convivia non tantum pudica colimus, sed et sobria: nec enim indulgemus epulis, aut convivium mero ducimus: sed gravitate hilaritatem temperamus. Casto sermone, corpore castiore, plerique inviolati corporis virginitate perpetua fruuntur potius quam gloriantur. (Paris. 1838, 466.)

^f Athenag. Legat. p. 34. "Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ τροφὰς καὶ μίξεις λογοποιούσιν ἄβιους καθ' ἡμῶν, ἵνα τε μιστὶν νομίζουσιν μετὰ λόγου, καὶ οἰόμενοι τῇ δεδίττισθαι, ἣ τῆς ἐνστάσεως ἀπάξιν ἡμᾶς τοῦ βίου, ἢ πικροὺς καὶ ἀπαραιτήτους, τῇ τῶν αἰσίων ὑπερβολῇ, τοὺς ἀρχόντας παρεσκευάζειν. (Hag. 1742, p. 308.)

^g Theophil. ad Autolye. lib. iii. p. 119. Φασκόντων ὡς κοινὰς ἀπάντων οὕσας τὰς γυναῖκας ἡμῶν, καὶ διαφόρῃ μίξιν ζυνόντας, ἵτι μὴν καὶ ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀδελφαῖς συμμίγνυσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἀβιώτατον καὶ ὀμώτατον, πασῶν σαρκῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἱφάπτεισθαι ἡμᾶς.

^h Tertul. Apol. c. vii. Dicimur sceleratissimi de sacramento infanticidii, et pabulo inde, et post convivium incesto, quod eversores luminum canes, lenones scilicet, tenebras, et tum libidinum impiarum inverecundiam procurent. Dicimur tamen semper, nec vos, quod tamdiu dicimur, eruere curatis. &c. (P. 7.)

ⁱ Minuc. Octav. c. ii. n. vii. seq. p. 29, edit. Halens. De initiandis tirunculis fabula tam detestanda quam nota est. Infans farre contextus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur ei qui sacris imbuitur: is infans a tirunculo farris superficie, quasi ad innoxios ictus provocato, cæcis occultisque vulneribus occiditur. Hujus (proh nefas!) sitienter sanguinem lambunt: hujus certatim membra dispertiunt: hac federantur hostia: hac conscientia sceleris ad silentium mutuum pignerantur. Hæc sacra sacrilegii somnibus tetriora. Et de convivio notum est: passim omnes loquuntur, id etiam Cirtensis nostri testatur oratio. Ad epulas solemoni die coëunt, cum omnibus liberis, sororibus, matribus; sexus omnis homines et omnis ætatis. Illic post multas epulas, ubi convivium caluit, et incestæ libidinis ebrietate fervor exarsit, canis qui candelabro nexus est, jactu offulæ ultra spatium lineæ qua vinctus est, ad impetum et saltum provocatur. Sic everso et extincto consorcio lumine, impudentibus tenebris nexus infandæ cupiditatis involvunt per incertum sortis; et, si non omnes opera, conscientia tamen pariter incesti; quoniam voto universorum appetitur, quidquid accidere potest in actu singulorum. (P. 433.)

^k Origen. cont. Cels. lib. vi. p. 302. Μετὰ ταῦτα παραπλήσιόν τι ποιῶν μοι δοκῶ τοῖς διὰ πολλὴν τὴν πρὸς Χριστιανούς ἀπίχθειαν διαβόλαιουμένους πρὸς τοὺς μεθαρμῶς ἰδόντας τὰ Χριστιανῶν, ὅτι ἔρα τῇ πείρᾳ κατέλιπεν Χριστιανούς ἰσθιόντας σάρκας παιδιῶν, καὶ μίξει ταῖς πρὸς τὰς παρ' αὐτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀναίδην χρωμένους.

^l Justin. Martyr. Apol. i. p. 50. Τίς φιλήδονος, ἢ ἀπραγῆς, καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων

the reader may find at large, collected by the learned Kortholt,^m in his book *De Calumniis Paganorum*, &c. The reason of this charge is by many of the ancients ascribed to the vile practices of the Carpocratians,ⁿ and other heretics, at least tacitly or indirectly, whilst they accuse them of this crime, which the heathens turned upon the Christians in general; and so it is said, upon their authority, by many modern authors.^o Œcumenius ascribes it to another reason: he says,^p “In the persecution of the Christians at Lyons, under Antoninus, the heathens having apprehended some servants of certain Christian catechumens, put them to the rack, to make them confess some secret of the Christians; and they having heard their masters say, that the holy communion was the body and blood of Christ, and supposing it to be truly flesh and blood (αὐτοὶ νομίζοντες τῷ ὄντι αἷμα καὶ

σσεκῶν βορᾶν ἀγαθὸν ἡγούμενος, δύνατο ἂν θάνατον ἀπαρξίσθαι, ὅπως τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν στερηθῇ; — Id. Apol. ii. p. 70, b. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ δύσφημα ἐκείνα μυθολογούμενα ἔργα πράττουσι, λυχνίας μὲν ἀνατρεπὴν, καὶ τὰς ἀναίδην μίξεις, καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων σσεκῶν βορᾶς, οὐ γινώσκωμιν. — Id. Dialog. cum Tryph. c. 227, b. Μὴ καὶ ὑμῖς πιστιστύκασι περὶ ἡμῶν, ὅτι δὴ ἰσθίωμιν ἀνθρώπους, καὶ μιτὰ τὴν εὐλασίην ἀποσδινύντες τοὺς λύχνους, ἀθίσμοις μίξισι ἰγνυλιόμινθα;

^m Kortholt. de Calumn. Pagan. c. xviii. p. 157–172.

ⁿ Epiphani. Hæres. Gnostic. n. v. Paris. p. 87. Κατασπᾶσαντες τὸ ἔμβρυον καιρῷ, οἷον δ' ἂν ἱσχυιέρησιν, λαμβάνουσιν ἐκτραφὴν τοῦτο. τὸ βεῖφος, ἐν ἔλμῳ τινὶ κόπτουσιν ὑπὲρ, καὶ ἰγκυαταμίζαντες μίλι καὶ σίπυρι, καὶ ἄλλα σινὰ ἀρώματα, καὶ μύρα, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ναυτιῶν αὐτοὺς· οὕτως συναχθίντες πάντες, οἱ [τῆς] τῶν χείρων τούτων καὶ κτηνῶν διασώσας, μιταλαμβάνουσιν ἱκαστος τῇ δακτύλῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατακοπίντες παιδίου καὶ οὕτως τὴν ἀνθρωποβορίαν ἀπειργασάμενοι, εὐχοντάς λειπὸν τῷ Θεῷ, κ. τ. λ. — Euseb. lib. iv. c. vii. tot. — Aug. de Hæres. cc. xxvi. xxvii. Sacramenta perhibentur funesta habere: nam de infantis anniculi sanguine, quem de toto ejus corpore minutis punctionum vulneribus extorquent, quasi eucharistiam suam conficere perhibentur, miscentes eum farinæ, panemque inde facientes. Qui puer ai mortuus fuerit, habetur apud eos pro martyre; si autem vixerit, pro magno sacerdote. (viii. p. 8, B.)

^o Dall. de Object. Cult. Relig. lib. ii. c. cxviii. tot. pp. 332–328. — Baron. an. 120, n. xxii.; et an. 179, n. xlii.

^p Œcumen. in 1 Pet. iii. 16. Χριστιανῶν κατηχουμένων δούλους Ἑλλήνις συλλαβόντες, ἵνα μεθὴν τι παρὰ τούτων δῆλιν ἀπορήτοι περὶ Χριστιανῶν ἀναγκάζοντες, οἱ δούλοι οὗτοι μὴ ἔχοντες πῶς τὸ τοῖς ἀναγκάζουσι καθ' ἥδονην ἱεῖν, παρόσον ἦκουσι τῶν δισποτῶν, τὴν θείαν μιτάληψιν αἷμα καὶ σῶμα εἶναι Χριστοῦ, αὐτοὶ νομίσαντες τῷ ὄντι αἷμα καὶ σῶμα εἶναι, τοῦτο ἐξέπιον τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν· οἱ δὲ λαβόντες ὡς αὐτόχρημα τοῦτο τιλιῦσθαι Χριστιανοῖς, καὶ δὴ τοῦτο τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλήσιν ἐξέπομπουν· καὶ τοὺς μάρτυρας Σάγκτον καὶ Βλανδίαν ἰμολογῆσαι διὰ βασάνων ἠνάγκαζον· οἷς ἐυστόχως Βλανδίνα ἐπαρήρσιεσται, πῶς ἂν ἰκεῖνα, τούτων ἀνάσχωντο οἱ μὴ δὲ τῶν ἱερμίων κριῶν δι' ἄσκησιν ἀπολαύοντες. (Paris. 1631, vol. ii. p. 498.)

σάρκα εἶναι), to gratify the inquisitors they told them what they had heard. And the heathens understanding this, as if the Christians had really (αὐτόχρημα) ‘ate flesh and blood,’ put two of the martyrs, Sanctus and Blandina, to the rack, to make them confess it; to which Blandina smartly replied, ‘How should they endure to do this, who, for exercise sake, abstain from such flesh as they might lawfully eat?’” If this were true, it would prove that the heathens grounded their calumny upon a false apprehension they had of the Christian sacrament; but it would by no means prove what Perron and many of the Romanists would have, that the ground of the fable was the real belief of Christians, as if they believed the eucharist to be the real proper flesh and blood of Christ: for this is expressly said to be only a false apprehension of the heathens, and utterly denied by the Christians, according as Œcumenius relates the story. Which yet is something different from the genuine acts in Eusebius:⁴ for there is no mention made of the eucharist in the story, but it is only said, “That when some of the Christian servants, who were heathens, were apprehended, they, fearing to be tormented, did, by the motion of Satan, and the instigation of the soldiers prompting them to it, falsely accuse the Christians, as if they were used to feast upon man’s flesh, and commit incest, and other the like things, which it is not fit either to speak or think, and which we can hardly believe were ever done by any men whatsoever.” So that the Christians’ belief about the eucharist could not be the ground of this story, but it either sprung from the practices of the Carpocratians, or else (as the learned Kortholt,⁵ not without some probable reasons, in-

⁴ Euseb. lib. v. c. l. Vales. 127, B. (p. 127, edit. Colon.) Συνελαμβάνοντο δὲ καὶ ἰθνηκοὶ τινες οἰκίται τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπὶ δημοσίᾳ ἐκίλισον ὁ ἡγμένων ἀναζητήσθαι πάντας ἡμᾶς· οἱ δὲ κατ’ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ, φοβηθέντες τὰς βασάνους, ἃς τοὺς ἁγίους ἔδεικνον πάσχοντας· τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐπὶ ταῦτο παρεμμένων αὐτοὺς, κατεψεύσαντο ἡμῶν θύσις τε δῖπνα· καὶ Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις, καὶ ὅσα μὴτι λαλοῦν μὴτι ποιεῖν θίμην ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ δὲ πιστεύουν, εἴ τι τοιοῦτο πάσσοι παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἐγίνετο.

⁵ Kortholt. de Calumn. Pagan. c. xviii. p. 163. Ex his infandis hæreticorum facinoribus natæ creduntur istæ adversus Christianos veteres calumniæ, de quibus supra dicebamus. Sed enim, si dixerimus, quæ ad eum modum memoratis illis hæreticis tribuuntur, non usque adeo certa videri, quia de iis dubitare liceat nihil,

clines to believe) it took its rise from the pure malice and fiction of the heathens themselves, some of whom never stuck at saying any thing that would render the Christians odious. However, though there were many who thus calumniated these Christian feasts by this variety of charges, yet there were some also who could discern the good effects of them, and the great influence they had not only on their own members, but the very heathen, who sometimes would cry out and say, "See how these Christians love one another!" as Tertullian* notes, in speaking of their collations and charity. Nay, Julian himself, though the bitterest enemy the Christians ever had, could not help bearing testimony to the usefulness of this practice, which he looked upon with an envious eye, as that which he imagined chiefly to uphold the Christian religion, and undermine the religion of the Gentiles. For thus, in one of his letters to his Gentile priests, he provokes them to the exercise of charity by the example of the Christians, and their feasts of charity. "There is the more reason to be careful in this matter," says he,^t "because it is manifestly the neglect of this humanity in the priests which has given occasion to the impious Galileans (so he commonly styles the Christians) to strengthen their party, by the practice of that humanity which the others have neglected; for, as kidnappers steal away children, whom they first allure with a cake, so these begin

forte absurdi designaverimus. Cur ita sentiam, dicam paucis, judicio interim ac decisioni doctiorum rem omnem committens, &c.

* Tertul. Apol. c. xxxix. Vide ut invicem se diligant!

^t Julian. Fragment. Epist. p. 555, (p. 305, edit. Lips. 1696, fol.) Διῆγμα τοῦ φιλοθίου μιν, εἰ τοὺς οἰκίους ἅπαντας εἰς τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσίβειαν εἰσαγάγοι τοῦ φιλανθρώπου δι, εἰ καὶ ἐξ ἐλπίων εὐκόλως κοινωῖ τοῖς διαμίνοις, καὶ μεταδίδωσι σποδύμας, εὖ ποιεῖν ἐπιχειρῶν ὅσους ἂν οἷός τε ᾦν. προσεκτικὸν γὰρ μέλλιστα τῷ μέρει αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἰατρειάν θέναι ποιητικόν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁμοίαι συνίβη, τοὺς πίηστας ἀμιγλίσθαι παρορρομένους ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν, οἱ δυσσεβεῖς Γαλιλαῖοι κατανοήσαντες, ἐπίβητο ταύτῃ φιλανθρωπία· καὶ τὸ χεῖριστον τῶν ἔργων, διὰ τοῦ δοκούστος τῶν ἰασηνδιωμάτων, ἐκράτουν. ὥσπερ οἱ τὰ παῖδια διὰ τοῦ πλακοῦντος ἐξαπατῶντες, τῷ καὶ δις καὶ τρεῖς προΐσθαι, πείθουσιν ἀκολουθεῖν ἑαυτοῖς. οἷψ' ὅταν ἀποστήσωσι πῶρρον τῶν οἰκίων, ἐμβάλλοντες εἰς ναῦν ἀπείδοντο· καὶ γίγονιν εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν ἐξῆς βίον πικρὸν τὸ δοῦν πρὸς ἐλπίων γλυκύ· τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐρέσιν ἀρξάμενοι διὰ τῆς λιγομένης παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀγάπης καὶ ὑποδοχῆς καὶ διακονίας τραπεζῶν· (ἴσται γὰρ ὥσπερ τὸ ἔργον, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὄνομα παρ' αὐτοῖς πολὺ) πιστοὺς ἰνῆγαγοι εἰς τὴν ἀβίτητα.

first to work upon honest-hearted Gentiles, with their love-feasts, and entertainments, and ministering of tables, as they call them, till at last they pervert them to atheism and impiety against the gods." This is a full vindication of them from all those aspersions which the former heathens had cast upon them, and an ample testimony of their usefulness from the mouth of an adversary, who saw and envied the progress which Christianity made in the world by means of these feasts of charity, which he was minded to introduce into his own way of heathen worship, with many other such rites, in imitation of the Christian institution. Happy had it been for the Christian religion, if Christians had never had occasion to object more against their own feasts of charity, than Julian, their bitterest enemy, could find to object against them! They might then have gone on with innocence and glory, and have continued a useful and laudable rite to this day.

CHAPTER VIII.

WHAT PREPARATION THE ANCIENTS REQUIRED AS NECESSARY
IN COMMUNICANTS, TO QUALIFY THEM FOR A WORTHY
RECEPTION.

SECT. I.—*A general Answer to this Question, by referring to the Professions made by every Christian in Baptism, of Repentance, Faith, and holy Obedience.*

I CANNOT better answer this question in general terms than by saying, the preparation which they required, as necessary, in every Christian, was the performance of the conditions and obligations which every man laid upon himself in baptism; the observation of which put a man in a Christian state, and the favour of God; and was a continual preparation for death and judgment; and, consequently, a continual and habitual preparation for approaches to God in prayer and holy mysteries (between which, as to what concerns preparation, the ancients made little or no distinction),

since it was a preparation that qualified a man for a constant daily or weekly communion, which was proper for those who were to receive the communion, in a manner, every day, according to the rules and practice of those primitive ages, as we shall see in the next chapter. Now the obligation which every man laid upon himself in baptism, as we have shewed in a former Book, was the profession and actual performance of these three things : 1. Repentance, or a renunciation of all former sin, together with the author of it, the devil. 2. Faith, or belief of the several articles of the Christian institution, or mystery of godliness. 3. A holy and constant obedience paid to the laws of this holy religion; in the performance of which sincerely, and without dissimulation, every man was supposed to be truly qualified for baptism. And what qualified him for baptism, also qualified him for the communion; of which there is certain evidence, that as soon as any man was baptized, he was immediately communicated: which could not regularly have been done, but upon presumption, that he that was duly qualified for baptism, was qualified for the communion also. So that he that continued in the strict observance of all the particulars of his baptismal covenant, was presumed to be in a constant habitual preparation for the communion every day: and this was that happy state of a Christian life, which qualified those primitive saints for such frequent reception, when frequency of communion kept up a flaming piety and universal holiness in their souls; and such a state of continual holiness made them always fit for, and desirous of, frequent communion. For these mutually acted in a holy combination, and reciprocally assisted each other: a habitual holiness was a constant preparation for the communion; and frequent communion was one of the best helps to keep them in a continual preparation for it. And to men of this character and behaviour there could be no great labour needful, besides the constant tenour of a pious life; nor any long time necessary to prepare for the Lord's table, when the whole business of their lives was but, as it were, one continued act of preparation for it. They lived as men that always expected death, yet uncertain of the time, and therefore

were in a continual preparation for it, which is the best preparation for the communion. Their loins were girded about, and their lamps burning; and they themselves like unto men that waited for their Lord, that when he came and knocked, they might open to him immediately. And to them belonged the blessing of Christ (Luke, xii. 37), "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find watching." It was true of them, if ever of any, that Christ came and found them watching: and he girded himself, and made them sit down to meat, in the spiritual feast, and came forth and served them.

SECT. II.—*What Failings are consistent with this Profession, and a State of Grace, and a continual Preparation for the Communion.*

But, it may be said, there is no such thing possible as constant preparation for the communion, for no man lives without sin to be repented of. In many things we offend all; and, if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.—But, notwithstanding this supposed difficulty, the fathers assure us, there were anciently many that were in a continual preparation for the communion, and did actually communicate every day. For those sins which unqualify men absolutely for the communion, are not those lesser sins of human frailty and infirmity, which are called sins of daily incursion, without which no man lives; but habitual and reigning sins, which men indulge, or such single acts of greater sins, as are answerable to habits of sin, and require a more severe repentance: such as adultery, murder, and the like; which wound the conscience to a high degree, and are not ordinarily cured in an instant, but, by a longer course of discipline, exacting both greater severities in repentance, and a longer time of probation. But those sins of human frailty, which the best of men daily commit in some degree or other, are not of this nature; but are such as are consistent with the profession of a good Christian, and a state of grace, and a continual preparation for the communion; and they do not exclude men from God's favour, so long as men labour and strive against

them, and mourn for them, as for infirmities, in a general and daily repentance, upon which God is willing to pardon them. If it were not so, there could be no such thing as preparation for the communion at all, and it would not only destroy frequent and daily communion, but communion in general, since no man lives without such infirmities; and if he were not to communicate till he had perfectly cured them, he must for ever abstain from communicating, and never come at the Lord's table: which were at once to destroy the very ordinance itself, by making the qualification for it impracticable, and rendering it impossible for any man to be perfectly and truly prepared for it. And it is to be feared that some, in these later ages, by over-straining the point, have done this great disservice to religion, by obliging men to such a preparation for the communion as is impracticable in itself, and frightening tender consciences from the holy ordinance under pretence of greater reverence to it: by which means it has sometimes happened, that they who, perhaps, have been the best prepared to receive it, have, by needless scruples or terrors, been kept at the greatest distance from it. But the ancients were extremely cautious of this delusion, and carefully taught men to distinguish between such sins as lay waste the conscience, and destroy a state of grace, and unqualify men for the communion; and such sins of infirmity and human frailty, as are consistent with a state of grace, and do not unqualify men for constant communion: being such as are done away by a general repentance, and daily prayer for pardon and forgiveness. This doctrine and distinction of sins is often inculcated by St. Austin, and others. It will be sufficient to hear their sense, in St. Austin's words, upon the article of remission of sins in the Creed,^a where, speaking to the catechumens, he

^a Aug. de Symbolo, lib. i. c. vii. (tom. ix. opp. p. 1101, edit. Basil. 1569.) Quum baptizati fueritis, tenete vitam bonam in præceptis Dei, ut baptismum custodiat is usque in finem. Non vobis dico, quia sine peccato heic vivetis; sed sunt venialia, sine quibus vita ista non est. Propter omnia peccata baptismus inventus est: propter levia, sine quibus esse non possumus, oratio inventa. Quid habet oratio? 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.' Semel abluimur baptis mate; quotidie abluimur oratione. Sed nolite illa committere, pro quibus necesse est, ut a Christi corpore separemini: quod absit a

tells them, when they had received baptism, they should be careful to preserve a good life in the commands of God, that they might keep their baptism to the end. "I do not say, that ye should live here without sin; but there are some venial sins, without which we cannot live in this life. Baptism is appointed for all sins, great and small; but for lesser sins, without which we cannot live, prayer is appointed. What says the prayer? 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' We are once cleansed by baptism, we are every day cleansed by prayer; but do not commit those things, for which it will be necessary for you to be separated from the body of Christ; which God forbid. For those whom ye see doing penance, have committed great crimes, either adultery, or some other grievous sins, for which they do penance: for, if their transgressions had been light, the daily prayer had been sufficient to blot

vobis. Illi enim quos videtis agere pœnitentiam, scelera commiserunt, aut adulteria, aut aliqua facta immania: inde agunt pœnitentiam. Nam si levia peccata ipsorum essent, ad hæc quotidiana oratio delenda sufficeret. — Id. in Enchirid. ad Laur. c. lxxi. (tom. iii. p. 177, cit. ed.) De quotidianis brevibus levibusque peccatis, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana oratio fidelium satisfacit. (vi. 163.) — Id. Serm. cxix. de Tempore, (tom. x. opp. p. 859, edit. Basil.) Quoniam vivituri sumus in isto sæculo, ubi quis non vivit sine peccato, ideo remissio peccatorum non est in sola oblatione sacri baptismatis, sed etiam in Oratione Dominica et quotidiana, quam post octo dies accepturi estis. (v. 656.) — Id. Epist. cviii. ad Seleucianam, (tom. iii. p. 507.) Est etiam pœnitentia bonorum et humilium fidelium pene quotidiana, in qua pectora tundimus, dicentes, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.' Neque enim ea nobis dimitti volumus, quæ dimissa non dubitamus in baptismo; sed illa utique, quæ humanæ fragilitati, quamvis parva, tamen crebra subrepunt, (ii. p. 681, C.) — Hom. xxvii. ex l. (tom. x. p. 480, v. 95, F.) Ubi illam ostendimus pœnitentiam quotidianam? Non habeo ubi melius ostendam, quam in Oratione Dominica, ubi Dominus orare nos docuit, quid ad Patrem dicamus ostendit, et in his verbis posuit, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.' Quæ debita, fratres? quandoquidem debita heic intelligi non possunt, nisi peccata; quæ debita dimisit in baptismo, iterum ut dimittat oramus? — Hom. xii. in Joan. p. 47, (p. 112, tom. ix. opp. edit. Basil.) In dilectione ejus et in misericordia ejus (Christi) qui ambulat, etiam liberatus ab illis lethalibus et grandibus peccatis, qualia sunt facinora, homicidia, furta, adulteria, propter illa, quæ minuta videntur esse peccata linguæ, aut cogitationum, aut immoderationis in rebus concessis, facit veritatem confessionis, et venit ad lucem in operibus bonis: quoniam minuta plura peccata si negligantur, occidunt. (ii. 284, B.) — Vide sis Hom. iii. in Psalm. cxviii. fere totam. But especially his book de Fide et Operibus, chap. xxvi., where he distinguishes three sorts of sins. 1. Such great

them out." By this we may judge, that sins of infirmity, to which all men are liable, and which were pardoned by their daily prayers, were reckoned no formal breaches of the baptismal covenant, nor, consequently, any just impediments to debar any man from receiving the communion every day (since none, except the Pelagians, thought it possible for men to live in such angelical perfection, as to be above all manner of failings in this mortal state of human frailty); and, therefore, they did not require of men, in order to communicate, such a perfection as human nature was not capable of attaining.

SECT. III. — *What Repentance required for such Failings.*

Yet for as much as lesser sins, even of infirmity, are transgressions of the law, and the remainders of corruption in our nature, and, in strictness, deserve punishment, if God should be extreme to enter into judgment with us for them; nay, and if they be indulged and neglected, may commence greater and deadly sins of wilfulness and contempt; therefore, upon this account, they advised, that men should not only ask pardon daily for them, and confess them with humiliation, and deplore them with sorrow; but also strive and labour against them with care, and diligence, and a perpetual watchfulness, and pray against them, and yield no consent to them, but have their wills continually bent against them, and hunger and thirst after the perfection of righteousness; and desire to be filled therewith when they came

sins for which men did public penance. 2. Such great sins as deserved to be corrected and punished with severe reproof, though they did not bring men under public penance: such as anger and evil speaking. 3. Sins of human frailty and daily incursion, for which the daily prayer was the daily medicine. This triple distinction of sins is the most exact of any other. *Nisi essent quædam ita gravia, ut etiam excommunicatione plectenda sint, non diceret apostolus, 'Congregatis vobis et meo spiritu tradere ejusmodi hominem satanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit in die Domini Jesu.' . . . Item nisi essent quædam non ea humilitate penitentiae sananda, qualis in ecclesia datur eis, qui proprie penitentes vocantur, sed quibusdam correptionum medicamentis, non diceret ipse Dominus, 'Corripe eum inter te et ipsum solum, et si te audierit, lucratus es fratrem tuum.'* Postremo nisi essent quædam, sine quibus hæc vita non agitur, non quotidianam medelam poneret in oratione quam docuit, ut dicamus, '*Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.*' (vi. p. 140, F.)

to the Lord's table. For, as Gregory the Great expresses it,^b "None are filled but those that hunger; who fast perfectly from sin, and receive the holy sacrament with a plenitude of virtue. Therefore, seeing the best of men cannot be wholly without sin, what remains, but that they should endeavour daily to evacuate and purge themselves from those sins with which human frailty never ceases to defile them? For he that does not daily draw off the dregs of sin, though they be but little sins which he amasses together, they will, by degrees, fill his soul, and deprive him of the benefit of internal satisfaction." In like manner, Gennadius^c persuades those who are guilty of no gross sins, but only of these lesser sins of infirmity, "to communicate every Lord's day, or oftener if they please; only with this caution, that their mind be free from all affection and love to such sins. For he that still retains a willingness to commit them, will find himself more oppressed than purified by receiving the eucharist. And, therefore, let such a one, when he is smitten or bitten in mind for his sin, cherish no will or inclination to his sin for the future; and, before he communicates, let him satisfy with prayers and tears; and so confiding in the mercy of the Lord, who uses to pardon sins upon a pious confession, let him come to the eucharist in security, and without doubting. But this I speak only of him who is not pressed with capital and deadly sins."

^b Gregor. lib. ii. in Reg. c. i. tom. i. p. 189, (tom. iii. part. ii. p. 59, edit. Paris. 1705.) Non saturantur, nisi famelici: qui a vitiis perfecte jejunantes Divina sacramenta percipiunt in plenitudine virtutis. Et quia sine peccato electi etiam viri esse non possunt, quid restat, nisi ut a peccatis, quibus eos humana fragilitas maculare non desinit, evacuare se quotidie conentur? Nam qui quotidie non exhaurit, quod delinquit; etsi minima sint peccata, quæ congerit, paulatim anima repletur, atque ei merito auferunt fructum internæ saturitatis.

^c Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. liii. (Inter Opera Aug. tom. iii. p. 205, edit. Basil. 1569.) Quotidie eucharistiæ communionem percipere nec laudo, nec reprehendo. Omnibus tamen Dominicis diebus communicandum suadeo et hortor, si tamen mens sine adfectu peccandi sit: nam habentem adhuc voluntatem peccandi, gravari magis dico eucharistiæ perceptione, quam purificari. Et ideo quamvis quis peccato mordeatur, peccandi non habeat de cetero voluntatem; et communicaturus satisfaciatur lacrimis et orationibus; et confidens de Domini miseratione, qui peccata piæ confessioni donare consuevit, accedat ad eucharistiam intrepidus et securus. Sed hoc de illo dico, quem capitalia et mortalia peccata non gravant.

SECT. IV.—*What Crimes unqualified Men absolutely for the Communion, and what sort of Repentance was required for them.*

“But,” says he, “if any man is pressed with the commission of mortal sins after baptism, I advise such a one to make satisfaction or amends by public repentance, and to be reconciled to communion by the judgment of the bishop or priest, if he would not receive the eucharist to his own judgment and condemnation.” This he speaks of such heinous offences as were direct violations of the baptismal covenant, upon the account of which men were then, by the usual discipline of the Church, debarred from communion and prayers, till they had, for a long time, gone through the several stages of public penance, and given such evident testimonies of their abhorrence of sin, and sincere conversion, as were requisite and proper to satisfy the Church that they were real and hearty penitents. In which state of probation they were held a year, or two, or three, or five, or ten, or twenty, according to the nature and quality of their offence; and sometimes all their lives, if their crime was extremely great and scandalous, when they were allowed communion only at the hour of death. And, during this course of discipline, they were obliged constantly to attend the church, to hear the Scriptures read, and the sermon preached for their instruction; and to exercise themselves in prayers, and confession, and tears, and watchings, and fastings, and alms-deeds, and good works, and whatever was proper to demonstrate that they were acting a sincere part, and not playing the hypocrite, in the business of repentance. Then, according to their zeal and earnestness in such employments, a judgment was made upon their sincerity; and the time of their penance was lengthened or shortened according to the measures of their activity; and when they were deemed perfectly to have amended their lives and become new men, answerable to the tenour of their first covenant, then they were reconciled, and absolved, and admitted again to the privilege of the communion. This was the standing rule of the Church with respect to those who

had committed gross and scandalous crimes, for which they were cut off from the body as putrefied members, and kept at a distance from the prayers of the Church, and the communion of the faithful at the Lord's table.

SECT. V.—*Scandalous and Notorious Sinners not to be admitted to Communicate, without giving Satisfactory Evidences of their Repentance.*

I need not stand here to enumerate all the particular crimes that were deemed breaches of the baptismal covenant, and unqualified men for the communion. Some account has been given already of them,^d in shewing what persons might, or might not, make their oblations at the altar: for they who might not offer, might much less communicate: and this matter will come to be considered more exactly in the next Book, when we treat of the discipline of the Church. Here I shall only observe in general, that the rules of the Church laid an obligation upon all ministers of the altar, to refuse the communion to all such notorious offenders, as were declared incapable and unworthy of it by the standing laws of communion, then well known to all in the Church: and that an overhasty admittance of such criminals, without sufficient time of probation and satisfactory evidence of their sincere conversion, was always reckoned a great transgression and failure in the exercise of the ministerial function. It will be sufficient, at present, to give two or three plain evidences of this out of Chrysostom and some others. “Let no cruel person,” says Chrysostom,^e “no unmerciful, no impure soul, come near this table. I speak this as well to you that receive the eucharist, as to you that minister. For it is necessary to say this to you that minister, that ye may distribute the gifts with great care. There is no small punishment hangs over your head, if ye give the eucharist

^d Book xv. chap. ii. sect. ii.

^e Chrysostom. Hom. lxxiii. in Matth. p. 705, B. (p. 869, edit. Francof.) Μηδὲς ἀπάθρωντος προσίτω, μηδὲς ὠμὸς καὶ ἀνελιγὴς, μηδὲς ἀπάθρωντος· ταῦτα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς μεταλαμβάνοντας λίγω, καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς διακονοῦντας· καὶ γὰρ ἀναγκάϊον καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς διαλεχθῆναι, ὅστε μὴ πολλῆς τῆς σπουδῆς διανίμωι [ταῦτα] τὰ δῶρα οὐ μικρὰ κίλασις ὑμῖν ἴσται, εἰ συνιδότος τινὶ πονηρίαν συγχωρήσῃτε μισαρχίῃν ταύτης τῆς τραπίζης· τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῶν χειρῶν ἐκζητηθήσεται τῶν

knowingly to any flagitious man. His blood shall be required at your hands. Though it be a general, though it be a consul, though it be he that wears the crown, if he comes unworthily, restrain him: thou hast greater power than he. But you will say, 'How shall I know what such or such an one is?' I speak not of those that are unknown, but of those that are known. I will say a fearful word: it is not so bad to admit energumens, [or persons possessed with a devil,] to this holy place, as those men, who, as St. Paul says, 'Tread Christ under foot, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and do despite to the Spirit of grace.' Let us not, therefore, cast out demoniacs only, but all such as come unworthily to be partakers of this table." It is a remarkable saying of St. Ambrose upon this occasion: 'Some men desire to be admitted to penance only for this reason, that they may presently receive the communion

ὁμιτήρων. καὶ στρατηγὸς τίς ἦ, καὶ ὑπαρχος, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τὸ διάδημα περιεπίμεινος, ἀναξίως δὲ προσίη, κώλυσον, μίζονα λαΐνου τὴν ἑξουσίαν ἔχους. οὐ δὲ εἰ μὴ πνητὴν ὕδατος ἰνυχιζέσθης φυλάττειν ποιμίῳ καθαράν· ἵνα ἴδῃς πρὸς αὐτὸν πολλὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ στόματος φέρον τὸν βόρβορον, οὐκ ἂν ἴσῃς ἱσιεύειν κάτω καὶ θάλλῃσαι τὸ ῥέον· οὐκ δὲ οὐχ ὕδατος, ἀλλὰ αἵματος καὶ πνύματος πνητὴν ἰνυχιζομένης, καὶ ἐρῶν γῆς καὶ βορβόρου χαλιπαυμένης ἁμαρτίαν ἔχοντάς τινας καὶ προσιόντας, οὐκ ἀγανακτεῖς οὐδὲ ἀπείργεις. καὶ τίνα ἂν σχοίης συγγνώμην; Διὰ τοῦτο ὁμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐτίμησεν ταύτην τὴν τιμὴν, ἵνα τὰ τοιαῦτα διακρίνηται· τοῦτο ὁμῶν ἡ ἀξία, τοῦτο ἡ ἀσφάλεια, τοῦτο ὁ στίφανος ἄσπας· οὐχ ἵνα λευκὸν χιτῶνίσκον καὶ ἀποστρίλδοντα περιβαλλόμενοι περιήτοι· καὶ πόθεν οἶδα, φησὶ, τὸν δῖον [καὶ τὸν δῖον]; οὐ περὶ τῶν ἀγνοουμένων, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν γνωρίμων λίγων· ἴσῃσι τι φρικωδέστερον οὐχ οὕτω χαλιπῶν τοὺς ἐνεργουμένους ἵδον ἵπαι, ὡς ταύτους, οὐς φησὶ ὁ Παῦλος, τὸν Χριστὸν καταπατήσαι, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγίῃσθαι, καὶ τοῦ πνύματος τὴν χάριν ἰνυχίσει· δαμινοῦντας γὰρ χεῖρας, ὁ ἡμαρτηκὼς καὶ προσιόν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἱερὴν δαμοῶσιν, οὐ κολάζονται· οὗτοι δὲ ὅταν ἀναξίως προσίωσιν, ἀθανάτην παρὰ δίδονται τιμωρίαν. Μὴ τοίνυν τούτους ἱλαυνώμεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἀπώλῃ, οὓς ἂν ἴδωμεν ἀναξίως προσιόντας. — Id. in Psalm. xlix. p. 303, D. (p. 264, edit. cit.) "Αν τοίνυν ἴδῃς τινὰ τῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἀγυλαζομένων πορεύοντα, καὶ μυστηρίους προσερχόμενον, ἐπὶ τῷ διακονομένῳ τῇ τούτων διανομῇ· ὁ δῖος ἀνάξιος τῶν μυστηρίων κώλυσον τὰς βεβήλους χεῖρας. εἰ γὰρ μηδὲ δηγίσθαι τὰ δικαιοῦματα ἄξιος, ἰνύσῃς, οἷα προδίδεται τὰ τῆς κολάσεως αὐτῷ, ὅταν καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀπτηται τραπίδος, οὐκ αὐτῷ δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ συσπιάζοντι.

† Ambros. de Pœnitent. lib. ii. c. ix. Nonnulli ideo poscunt pœnitentiam, ut statim sibi reddi communionem velint. Hi non tam se solvere cupiunt, quam sacerdotem ligare: suam enim conscientiam non exuunt, et sacerdotis induunt, cui præceptum est, 'Nolite sanctum dare canibus, neque miseritis margaritas vestras ante porcos:' hoc est, immundis impuritatibus sacræ communionis non impertienda consortia. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 116.)

again: these men do not so much desire to be absolved themselves, as to bind the priest: for they do not put off their own evil conscience. Such a rash act in a priest, in receiving a notorious criminal, without any clear evidences and fruits of repentance, puts him in the sinner's condition, and makes him a criminal before God for the abuse of the authority committed to him." Therefore, as the Novatians were generally condemned for being too rigorous in denying the communion for ever to all such as fell into great sins after baptism; so, on the other hand, the Audian heretics are censured for being too hasty,^g in assuming authority to pardon sins by their own power, and granting remission upon a bare confession, without prescribing a time for repentance, as the laws of the Church always required. Cyprian gives as severe a reproof to such of the clergy as were overhasty in admitting those that had lapsed into idolatry in time of persecution, before they had gone through a due course of penance, and had taken time to bewail and confess their sin, and give sufficient evidences of their repentance. "When as," says he,^h "sinners, for much lesser crimes, take a just time to do penance; and, according to the order of discipline, come to confession; and, by imposition of hands given them by the bishop and clergy, receive a right to communicate; now, they are very hastily and unseasonably admitted to communion, and their name is offered; and, before they have done penance, before they have made their confession, before they have received imposition of hands, the eucharist is given them, although it be

^g Theodoret. de Fabul. Hæret. lib. iv. c. x. *Καλεύουσι τὰ πλημμεληθέντα ὁμολογῶν ἵνα τοῖς ὁμολογηκόσιν δωροῦνται τὴν ἄφισιν· οὐ χρόνον ὀριζόμενοι εἰς μετάνοιαν, καθὰ καλεύουσιν οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας Δισμοὶ, ἀλλ' ἐξούσια ποιούμενοι τὴν συγχώρησιν.* (Hal. 1772, iv. 365.)

^h Cyprian. Epist. x. al. xvi. ad Cler. p. 37, (p. 195, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) *Quum in minoribus peccatis, agant peccatores pœnitentiam justo tempore, et secundum disciplinæ ordinem ad exomologesin veniant, et per manus impositionem episcopi et cleri jus communicationis accipiant: nunc crudo tempore, persecutione adhuc perseverante, nondum restituta ecclesiæ ipsius pace, ad communicationem admittuntur, et offertur nomen eorum, et nondum pœnitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illis datur, quum scriptum sit: Qui ederit panem aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini.*

said, 'That whosoever eats the bread and drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.'" The martyrs, who lay in prison, were a little concerned in this irregularity: for they were used to intercede for such criminals, to gain them admission before their time: and, therefore, he wrote another letter to the martyrs,¹ to shew them the danger and inconveniences of such precipitated communicating of sinners, and to dissuade them from such unseasonable interposing in their behalf, before they had done their regular penance. And he also wrote a long discourse to the lapsers themselves,² wherein he more largely sets forth the fallacy that was put upon them by this too indulgent facility in granting them such a preposterous peace, which did not really give them peace, but destroy it; nor grant them true communion, but hinder their salvation. By all which, and abundance more that might be added upon this head, it is evident, that to reconcile a sinner to the altar, after the commission of any heinous and public crimes, they required him to go through a long course of penance publicly in the church, in order to give clear satisfaction and demonstration by manifest works and fruits of repentance, that he was a real convert, and worthy of the communion which he desired: and to admit him before, was only to impose upon the sinner, and incur the displeasure of God, by prostituting his ordinance, and suffering the vile to tread under foot the Son of God.

But beside these heinous sins, which put men under the public censures of the Church, there were also many other crimes of a heinous nature, which unqualified men for worthy receiving, though they did not ordinarily bring them to a state of public penance, either because men could not be so directly and formally convicted of them, or because they did not seem to carry so great malignity and contempt of God in them as the former. Among these St. Austin³ reckons anger and evil speaking; and others add, rash swearing, breach of promise, lying, covetousness, drunken-

¹ Cyprian. Epist. xl. al. xv. ad Martyr. tot. p. 34, (p. 191-197, edit. cit.)

² Ibid. de Lapsis, p. 128, seq. (p. 27, seq. edit. cit.)

³ Aug. de Fide et Operibus, c. xxvi.

ness, and sins of the like nature. Now though these did not ordinarily subject men to public penance, yet they were confessed, on all hands, to be grievous and deadly sins, and such as men should not presume to come with, unrepented of, to the Lord's table. And, therefore, though the ancients did not forcibly repel such sinners from communicating, yet they never failed to stave them off by admonitions and reproofs, declaiming sharply against all such vices, and shewing men the danger of them, as well as those of the highest nature.

SECT. VI.—*Whether they required Confession of Private Sins to the Priest as a necessary Qualification for the Communion.*

This was their constant way of proceeding with great and heinous sinners, when their crimes were public, notorious, and scandalous, in order to qualify them for a worthy participation of the eucharist after any manifest breach or violation of their baptismal covenant. As to private crimes, they laid no necessity upon the conscience of men to make either public or private confession of them to any beside God, to qualify them for the communion. They sometimes advised men to public confession for private crimes, and many times men voluntarily confessed their private crimes, and submitted to do public penance for them, as thinking this the securest way to obtain perfect forgiveness of God: and in some places a public minister, called the penitentiary, was appointed to hear men's confessions, and direct them in their public or private repentance. But as yet no indispensable obligation was laid upon men to make confession of their private crimes, as a necessary condition of communion; much less did they enjoin men auricular confession, in order to obtain private absolution of a priest, and do penance afterward, without giving, at present, any evident demonstrations of repentance. Their private confessions were all voluntary, and these chiefly in order to public penance; but, whether for public or private penance, the confession of private sins was a matter of advice, and prudence, and free choice, and not forced upon men by any laws of necessity, or

indispensable obligation. I shall have further occasion to handle this matter more fully in the next Book, about the discipline of the Church; and, therefore, I will only mention a passage or two here, that relate to men's preparation for the communion. Chrysostom, explaining those words of the apostle, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," says,^l "He does not bid one man examine another, but every one himself: making the judgment private, and the trial without witnesses." And again expounding the very same words, "The apostle," says he,^m "does not reveal or lay open the sore, he does not bring the accusation upon the open stage, he does not set witnesses of thy crimes against thee: but bids thee, within thy own conscience, none being present but God, who knows all things, to set up a judgment and search after thy sins; and, recounting thy whole life, to bring thy sins to the bar of thy own mind; to reform thy excesses; and so with a pure conscience to come to the sacred table, and partake of the holy sacrifice." And it is remarkable, that, under Nectarius, St. Chrysostom's predecessor, a law was made (upon occasion of a scandal that was given by the confession of a gentlewoman, defiled by a deacon at Constantinople), "That the office of the penitentiary priest, which had been for some time in that Church, should be laid aside; and that liberty should be given to every one, upon the private examination of his own conscience, to partake of the holy mysteries." Which evidently shews, that they did not then believe there was any Divine law for the necessity of auricular confession, but that it was a matter of liberty and prudence only. Socrates, who re-

^l Chrysostom. Hom. xxviii. in 1 Cor. p. 569, (p. 301, edit. Francof.) Οὐχ ἵτερον ἰτίεω κελύει δοκιμάσαι, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ἑαυτὸν, ἀκημοσύνην ποιῶν τὸ δικαστήριον, ἀμέρετον τὸν ἑλισχον.

^m Ibid. Hom. viii. de Pœnitent. tom. i. p. 700, D. (p. 620, edit. cit.) Οὐκ ἀπειλάψει τὸ ἔλκος· οὐκ εἰς κοινὸν θιάτρου ἤγαγε τὴν κατηγορίαν οὐ περιστοίησε μέρετας τῶν πλημμελημάτων· ἵνδον ἐν τῷ συνιδόσι, μηδινὸς παρόντος πλὴν τοῦ πάντα ὀρώντος Θεοῦ, ποιῶν τὴν κρίσιν, καὶ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων τὴν ἑξίτασιν, καὶ πάντα τὸν βίον ἀναλογιζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦ τὸ κριτήριον ἀγί, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα διόρθου τὰ πλημμελήματα, καὶ οὕτω μετὰ καθαροῦ τοῦ συνιδότος τῆς ἱεῖρας ἄπτου τραπίζης, καὶ τῆς ἁγίας μέντοιχης θυσίας.

lates the whole story, says,^a “ He had it from the mouth of Eudæmon, the presbyter, who gave Nectarius this advice.” And Sozomen adds,^o “ That the bishops of most other Churches followed Nectarius’s example.” In the Latin Church, it appears also from Gennadius,^p that the general rule for great crimes of a public nature, was to do public penance in the church ; but, for private crimes, no other was necessarily required but private satisfaction, by a change of life from secular to religious, by continual mourning to implore God’s mercy, by doing things contrary to those whereof the sinner repents, and by receiving the eucharist every Lord’s day, to the end of his life. And Laurentius, bishop of Novaria, speaking of repentance, says,^q “ After baptism, God hath appointed thee a remedy within thyself: he hath put remission in thy own power, that thou needest not to seek a priest when necessity requires ; but thou thyself, now, as a skilful master always at hand, mayest correct thy own error within thyself, and wash away thy sin by repentance.” It were easy to add abundance more testimonies both out of the Greek and Latin writers, but these are sufficient at present to shew, that they did not require private confession as any necessary part of that preparation which

^a Socrat. lib. v. c. xix. Εὐδαίμων τις τῆς ἑκκλησίας πρεσβύτερος, γνώμην τῷ ἱερωτάτῳ δίδωσι Νεκταρίῳ, περιελὼν μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερον· συγχωρεῖναι δὲ ἑασθαι, τῷ ἰδίῳ συνιδόντι τῶν μυστηρίων μετίχυν. (Vales. 229.)

^o Sozom. lib. vii. c. xvi. Ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ, τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν μετανοούντων τιταγμένον πρεσβύτερον οὐκίτι συγχωρεῖσιν εἶναι πρῶτος Νεκτάριος, ὁ τὴν ἑκκλησίαν Κωνσταντινουπόλει· πιστοραύων· ἱσχυροδύσθαι δὲ σχιδὸν οἱ πανταχοῦ ἱσίστασθαι. (Vales. 589.)

^p Gennad. de Dogmat. Eccles. c. liii. (ap. Aug. tom. iii. p. 205.) Quem mortalia crimina, post baptismum commissa premunt, hortor prius publica pœnitentia satisfacere, et ita sacerdotis judicio reconciliatum communioni sociari, si vult non ad judicium et condemnationem sui eucharistiam percipere. Sed et secreta satisfactione solvi mortalia crimina non negamus, sed mutato prius sæculari habitu, et confesso religionis studio per vitæ correctionem, et jugi, immo perpetuo, luctu, miserante Deo, ita duntaxat, ut contraria pro iis quæ penitet, agat, et eucharistiam omnibus Dominicis diebus simplex et submissus usque ad mortem suscipiat.

^q Laurent. hom. i. de Pœnit. Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 129, edit. Paris. 1654. Post baptismum, remedium tuum in te ipso statuit, remissionem in arbitrio tuo posuit, ut non quæras sacerdotem, quum necessitas flagitaverit: sed ipse jam, ac si scitus perspicuusque magister, errorem tuum intra te emendes, et peccatum tuum pœnititudine ablueas.

men were obliged to make, for the purging of private sins before they came to the Lord's table. But their direction was the apostle's rule: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."

SECT. VII. — *That Preparation consists not in coming to Communion at certain holy Seasons, but in Sanctity and Purity at all Times.*

Yet they did not hereby discharge men of all obligation to cleanse themselves from sin, but carefully pressed upon the conscience the necessity of universal purity, when they came to feast upon the body and blood of Christ at his table. "Let a man examine himself: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." There were some so vain as to think, that a formal appearing at the Lord's table, at some certain holy and solemn seasons, was all the preparation that was needful, as if the circumstance of time added any real qualification to their souls. Against these men's extravagance, St. Chrysostom inveighs with the greatest sharpness: "I observe many," says he, "who are partakers of the Lord's body inconsiderately, and at all adventures, more out of custom, than by any rule, or reason, and understanding. If the holy time of Lent comes, or the day of Christ's Epiphany, or Nativity, then they partake of the holy mysteries, whatever condition they are in. But Epiphany is not the time of approaching; neither does Lent make men worthy to come, but the sincerity and purity of their souls. With this, come at all times; without it, come never. Con-

* Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1050, (p. 885, seq. edit. Francof.)
Παλλοὺς ἰδῶ τοὺς σώματος Χριστοῦ μισίχοντας ἀπλῶς, καὶ ὡς ἴτυχε, καὶ συνθηρίῃ μᾶλλον καὶ νόμῳ, ἢ λογισμῷ καὶ διανοίᾳ· ἂν ἰστέῃ, φησὶν, ὁ τῆς ἁγίας τισευρακοστῆς καιρὸς, ὅς τις ἐὰν ἢ τις, μισίχῃ τῶν μυστηρίων, ἂν ἰστέῃ τῶν ἐκφανῶν ἡμῖς· καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς προσόδου· οὐκ ἐκφάνια· οὐδὲ τισευρακοστὴ καὶ αἰῶν τοῦ προσίναι, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς εὐκρινεία, καὶ καθαρότης· μετὰ ταύτης αὖ προσέθι, χωρὶς ταύτης μηδέποτε· ὁσάκις γὰρ, φησὶ, τοῦτο ποιῶν, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, τουτίσται, ὑπόμνησιν ποιεῖτε τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τῆς ὑπεργραφείας τῆς ἰμῆς· ἐνίστην, οἱ τῆς θυσίας μισίχοντες τῆς παλαιᾶς πόσε· ἐκίχρηστο τῇ φιδῷ· τί οὐκ ἔκρεττον; τί οὐκ ἐποίησαν; πάντοτε ἐκαθέρωντο· σὺ δὲ θυσία προσιών, ἦν καὶ ἄγγιλοι φρίττουσι, καιρῶν περιόδους τὸ πρῶγμα

sider those who were partakers of the sacrifices under the old law. What abstinence did they use? What did they not do? What did they not perform, to purify themselves in every respect? And dost thou, when thou comest to the sacrifice, at which the angels are even amazed, and tremble, measure the business by the revolutions and periods of certain times and seasons? How wilt thou stand before the tribunal of Christ, who darest to touch his body with polluted hands and lips? Thou wouldst not presume to kiss the king with a stinking mouth: and dost thou kiss the King of Heaven with a stinking soul? That is the highest affront that can really be offered him. Tell me, wouldst thou choose to come to the sacrifice with unwashen hands? I suppose not, but wouldst rather not come at all, than with unclean hands. Since, therefore, thou art so scrupulous and religious in a small matter, how darest thou to come and touch the sacrifice with a polluted soul? When, as thy hands only hold it for a time, but thy soul has it wholly dissolved into it. At other times ye come not to it, though ye be clean; but at Easter ye come, although ye be defiled with sin. Oh, custom! oh, prejudice!" Thus St. Chrysostom reproves those who contented themselves with an outside formal preparation, to comply with the general custom of receiving at some of the holy festivals; which was a mere corporeal purification, like the Pharisaical righteousness: for "They made clean the outside of the cup and platter, whilst their inward part was full of corruption, and all

ὀρίζεις; καὶ πῶς παραστήσῃ τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μισραῖς χερσὶ καὶ χεῖλεσι κατατελμῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ σώματος; καὶ βασιλῖα μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἴλοιο καταφιλήσαι, ἰδοὺ δὲ σου τοῦ στόματος, τὸν δὲ βασιλῖα σου τοῦ ψυχῇ καταφιλῆσαι ἰδοὺναι; ὕβρις τὸ πρῶτόν ἐστιν. εἰπὶ μοι, ἄρα ἂν ἴλοιο χερσὶν ἀνίστασαι τῇ θυσίᾳ προσελθὼν; οὐκ ἔγω γὰρ εἶμαι· ἀλλ' ἴλοιοις ἂν μὴδὲ ὅλους προσελθὼν, ἢ ῥυπαράς χερσὶν ὥτα ἐν τῷ μισρῷ ὥσπερ ἂν εὐλαβῆς, ψυχὴν ἔχων ῥυπαρὰν προσέρχῃ, καὶ ἀπαιτῶσαι τολμᾷ; καὶ τοι ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν χειρῶν πρὸς καιρὸν κατίχεται, εἰς δὲ ἐκείνην ἐλέγκηρος ἀναλύεται· τί δὲ, οὐχ ὁρᾷς τὰ σπύη οὕτω περικυλῶμενα; οὕτως ἀπολάμποντα; τούτων παθεστέρας ἡμῖν εἶναι διὰ τὰς ψυχὰς, τούτων ἀγιωτέρας καὶ λαμπροτέρας. τί δῆσποτε; ὅτι ἐκείνη δι' ἡμᾶς τῶν αὐτῶν γίνεται· ἐκείνη οὐ μιστίχῃ τοῦ ἰόντος, οὐκ αἰσθάνεται. ἡμῖς δὲ, καὶ ἵν' ἐν δὲ, ῥυπαρῇ μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἴλοιο χρῆσασθαι σπύη, ῥυπαρῇ δὲ ψυχῇ προσέρχῃ; πολλὰν ὁρῶ τοῦ πρῶτοντος τὴν ἀνωμαλίαν. ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις καιροῖς, οὐδὲ καθαροὶ πολλὰς ὄντες προσέρχονται, ἐν δὲ τῷ πάσχα, καὶ ἢ τι τεταρωμένον ἡμῖν, πρίντι· ὃ τῆς συνθείας, ὃ τῆς προσλήψεως.

uncleanness." In another place he thus opposes this fantastical preparation, and describes the true preparation of the soul by the purity of a man's conscience, and a sanctified life. "Many Christians, nowadays," says he,* "are sunk into so great stupidity and contempt, that though they be laden with sins, and take no manner of care of themselves, yet they come to the holy table at the solemn festivals, hand over head, and just as mere chance directs them; not considering, that what makes it seasonable to communicate, is not merely a festival, or the time of a more solemn assembly, but a pure conscience, and a life free from sin. For as he, who is conscious to himself of no enormous crime, ought to come every day; so, on the other hand, he who is fettered in sins, and does not repent, cannot safely come upon a festival; for it is not our coming once a-year that discharges us of our sins, if we come unworthily: but this very thing rather increases our condemnation, that though we come but once a-year, yet we come not, even then, with a pure conscience. Wherefore I exhort you all not to come to the holy mysteries barely upon the account of a festival; but, whenever ye design to partake of this holy sacrifice, to purge yourselves many days before, by repentance, and prayer, and alms, and attendance upon spiritual things; and not to return again, like the dog to his vomit. Is it not

* Chrysostom. Hom. xxxi. de Philog. tom. i. p. 402, D. (p. 357, edit. Francof.)

Νῦν εἰς τοσοῦτο ἀνοίας καὶ καταφρονήσεως πολλοὶ τῶν πιστῶν ἰληλάκασιν· ὡς καὶ μυρίων γήμοντες παπῶν, καὶ μηδεμίαν ὅλως ἑαυτῶν ἐπιμίλιαν ποιούμενοι, ἀπλῶς, καὶ ὡς ἴσχυιν ἐν ταῖς ἱερταῖς τῇ τραπίῃ ταύτῃ προσέρχονται, οὐκ εἰδότες, ὅτι καιρὸς κοινοῦς οὐχ ἱερτὴ καὶ πατήγυρις· ἀλλὰ συνιδὸς καθαρὸν καὶ βίος ἰγκλημάτων ἀπηλλαγμένος· καὶ καθάπερ τὸν οὐδὲν ἑαυτοῦ συνιδόντα φεῦλον καθ' ἑασέτην δι' προσίνας τὴν ἡμέραν· οὕτω τὸν ἐν ἀμαρτήμασι προκαταλημμένον, καὶ μὴ μετανοῶντα οὐδὲ ἐν ἱερτῇ προσίνας ἀσφαλὲς· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὸ ἀπαξ τοῦ ἱναυτοῦ προσελθὺν ἀπαλλάττει τῶν ἰγκλημάτων ἡμᾶς, ἀν' ἀναξίως προσίωμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο μυζήσας καταδικάζει· ὅτι ἀπαξ προσιόντες, οὐδὲ τότε καθαρῶς προσίμεν. διὰ τοῦτο παρακαλῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς, μὴ ἀπλῶς διὰ τὴν τῆς ἱερτῆς ἀνάγκην τῶν θείων ἀπαιτῆσαι μυστηρίων· ἀλλ' ἢ ποτε μίλλοις τῆς ἐλπίδος ταύτης μετρίξιν προσφορᾶς, πρὸ πολλῶν ἡμερῶν ἑαυτοὺς διακαθαίρου διὰ μετανοίας, καὶ ἐνύχης, καὶ ἰλημοσύνης, καὶ τῆς πλεῖς τὰ πνευματικὰ σχολῆς· καὶ μὴ πάλιν ἐπιστρέφειν καθάπερ κύων ἐπὶ τὸν ἴδιον ἵμιντον. Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄσπουσι τῶν μὲν σωματικῶν τοσαύτην ποιῆσθαι τὴν ἐπιμίλιαν, ὥστε, ἱερτῆς προαγούσης, πρὸ πολλῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ ἡμάτων ἐκ τῶν κινδυνῶν τὸ πάλλιστον ἀνελπίστους προεισπρίξιν καὶ ὑποδήματα ἀνύσθαι, καὶ τραπίῃ βαψιλιστέρα κίχρησθαι, καὶ πολλοὺς πάντοθεν προσισπινῶν πέτρους, πικρὴν τρέφῃ

absurd to spend so much care upon corporeal things, as that, when a festival approaches, you will bring forth your best clothes out of your wardrobe, and make them ready many days before, and buy you shoes, and prepare a more splendid table, and think of many ways to deck and adorn yourself; but, in the meantime, have no regard to your soul, which lies neglected in filth and nastiness, and ready to perish with famine, and overrun with impurity? How absurd is it to present the body here finely adorned, but your soul naked, and vilely clothed! When yet none sees your body but your fellow-servants; but your soul is nicely viewed by the Lord, who will also severely punish your neglect of it. Know you not, that this table is filled with spiritual fire, and sends forth secret flames, as fountains do their water in abundance? Bring not, therefore, hither wood, hay, stubble, lest you increase the flame, and burn your soul by such a participation; but bring hither gold, silver, precious stones, that ye may make those materials still more pure, and go hence with greater gain and advantage. If any evil remains in your soul, chase and drive it thence. Has any one an enemy, from whom he has suffered great injuries and injustice, let him dissolve his enmity, and restrain his flaming, swelling mind, that there be no tumult or perturbation within. For

φαιδρεύειν ἑαυτὸν καὶ καλλωπίζειν τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς ἡμελημένης, ῥυτίωσης, αὐχμώσεως, λιμῶ διαφθειρομένης, ἀπαθάρτου μινούσης, μηδὲνα ποιῆσαι λόγον· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν σῶμα καλλωπίζοντα εἰσάγειν ἵνα αὐτὰ ἐκείνη διὰ γυμνὴν καὶ ἀσχημονοῦσαν; καὶ τοὶ ταῦτο μὲν ὁ σύνδουλος ἑρῶ· καὶ βλάβος οὐδὲν, κἄν ὁπωσθεὺν διακρίμινον ᾗ· ἐκείνη δὲ ὁ διασπότης, καὶ μισγίστην ἰπάγει κόλασιν τῆς ἀμελείας· οὐκ ἴσται, ὅτι πρὸς αὐτὴν γίμει ἡ τράπεζα πνευματικῆς, καὶ καθάπερ αἱ πηγαὶ φύσει ὕδατος ἀναβλύζουσιν, οὕτω καὶ αὕτη φλόγα τιτὰ ἔχει ἄρρητον. Μὴ τοίνυν προσέλθῃς καλῶμενη ἔχων, μὴ ἔξωλα, μὴ χέρον· ἵνα μὴ πλείονα τὸν ἱμπερησμένον ἐργάσῃ, καὶ κατακαύσῃ τὴν μεταλαμβάνουσαν ψυχὴν· ἀλλ' ἔχων λίθους τιμίους, χρυσὸν, ἄργυρον· ἵνα καθαρωτέρων σαφές τῃ ὄλῃ, ἵνα πολλὴν λαβὴν τὴν ἱμπερίαν, ἀπὸ λῆθης· εἴ τι σπουδὴν, φυγάδισον ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς σου ἔχῃ τις ἰχθρὸν, καὶ τὰ μεγάλα ἡδίκηται; καταλείτω τὴν ἰχθρὴν, καταστειλάτω τὴν διάνοιαν φλογισμένην, εἰδῶσαν· ἵνα μηδὲς ἴδῃν θάρσος ἢ μηδὲ ταραχὴ· βασιλεία γὰρ ὑποδίσχεται μίλλαις διὰ τῆς κωνορίας· βασιλείας δὲ ἐκβαίνοντος τῇ ψυχῇ, πολλὴν εἶναι διὰ τὴν γαλήνην, πολλὴν τὴν ἡσυχίαν· βαθείαν τῶν λογισμῶν τὴν ἐρέτην· ἀλλὰ μεγάλα ἡδίκησαι, καὶ οὐ φέρις ἀφύπναι τὴν ἐργίαν· τί τοίνυν σαυτὸν πολλὰ μίζονα ἀδικίᾳ καὶ χαλσιπώτερον; οὐ γὰρ τοιαυτὰ σε διαθήσεται ὁ ἰχθρὸς, ἅπερ ἂν ποιῇ, οἷα σὺ σαυτὸν, μὴ καταλλαττόμενος πρὸς ἐκείνον· ἀλλὰ τοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατῶν νόμους· ὕβρις εἰς ἐκείνους· διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ σὺ τὸν Διὸς ὑβρίζῃ, εἰπὶ μοι; τὸ γὰρ μὴ καταλλάττεσθαι τῷ λιλυπηνότητι, οὐκ ἐκείνῳ

thou art now about to receive a king by communion ; and, when a king enters into thy soul, there ought to be a perfect calm, tranquillity, and silence, and a profound peace in thy thoughts. But thou hast been exceedingly injured, and canst not bear to moderate thy anger against him. What then? Wilt thou, therefore, more grievously injure thyself? For thy enemy, whatever he does, cannot do thee so much harm as thou dost to thyself, if thou art not reconciled to him, but tramplest on the laws of God. He has injured and affronted thee : and wilt thou injure and affront God? For not to receive an enemy to pardon and favour, is not so much to take revenge on him, as to affront God, who has given us this law of reconciliation. Therefore look not to thy fellow-servant, nor to the greatness of the injuries that he hath done thee ; but look unto God, and putting his fear into thy mind, consider this, that the greater violence thou offerest to thy soul, by compelling it to be reconciled, after suffering a thousand indignities, so much the greater honour shalt thou obtain from him who prohibits thee revenge. And as thou receivest God with great honour here, he will receive thee with great glory hereafter, and recompense thee a thousand-fold for this obedience.” Thus did this holy man explain, in general, the due manner and method of preparing to receive the eucharist, and with the strongest argu-

ιστην ἀμνημονίῳ τοσούτου, ὅσον τὸν Θεὸν ὑβρίζοντες τὸν ταῦτα νομοθετήσαντα μὴ τοῖνυι πρὸς τὸν σύνδουλόν Ἰδης· μηδὲ πρὸς τὸ μίγνθος τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἐκείνου· ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἐκείνου φίλον εἰς τοῦν βαλλόμενος, ἐκείνο σκόπῃσιν· ὅτι ὅσῳ ἂν μίζονα πάσχεις βίαν κατὰ ψυχὴν, μιστὰ μύρη κακὰ ἀναγκάζόμενος καταλλάττεισθαι τῇ λιλυπηκόσι, τοσούτῳ πλείονος ἀπολαύσῃ τιμῆς παρὰ τοῦ ταῦτα κεινύσαντος Θεοῦ· καὶ καθάπερ αὐτὸν μιστὰ πολλῆς ὑποδέχῃ τιμῆς ἰσταῦθα, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς μιστὰ πολλῆς ὑποδέχεται· οἱ τῆς δόξης ἐκεί, μυριοπλασίονος ἀποδοῦναι σοι τῆς ὑπακοῆς ταύτης τὰς ἀμοιβάς. — Id. Hom. lii. in eos qui pascha jejунant, tom. v. p. 710, C. D. (hom. lv. p. 636, edit. cit.) 'Ο μὴ νηστίαων, ἂν μιστὰ καθαροῦ προσίλθῃ συνιδόμενος, πάσχα ἱστιελιῦ, κἂν σήμερον, κἂν αὔριον, κἂν ἑποτιοῦν μιστάσχει τῆς κοινωνίας· οὐ γὰρ ἐν παρατηρήσει καίρων, ἀλλ' ἐν συνιδότι καθαροῦ ἡ ἀρίστη κρίνεται πρόσδος· ἡμῖς δὲ τούτανότιον ποιῶμεν· τὴν μὲν διάνοιαν οὐ καθαίρομεν· εἰ δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσίλθωμεν ἱκίνη, νομίζομεν πάσχα ἱστιελιῦ, κἂν μυρίων γήμωνων ἁμαρτημάτων· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλλὰ κἂν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ παύσασθαι προσίλθῃς μιστὰ ποικροῦ συνιδόμενος, ἔξίπτις τῆς κοινωνίας, ἀπῆλθῃς, οὐκ ἱστιελίσας τὸ πάσχα· ὥσπερ οὖν κἂν σήμερον κοινωνῇς, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀποινύόμενος, τὸ πάσχα ἱστιελίσας ἀκρίβως· ἰχρὴν τοῖνυι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ταύτην ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν ὑπόνοιαν, μὴ ἐν τῇ τῶν καίρων παρατηρήσει, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ προσόδῳ φυλάττων.

ments of piety, and the utmost force of eloquence and reason, endeavour to persuade his hearers to the practice of it.

SECT. VIII.—*What Faith is required in Communicants.*

I have not room to transcribe all that this author^t and the rest have said further in their general exhortations to make a due preparation for the communion: much less will it consist with the design of this work to descend to all the particular cases and questions that might be moved about it, the handling of which would easily swell into a volume: and the reader may find it already done in a great measure by our learned Bishop Taylor in his *Worthy Communicant*, where he states all the duties required in order to a worthy participation, together with the cases of conscience occurring in the duty of him that ministers, and in the duty of him that communicates, out of the ancient writers. I shall content myself to suggest a few things relating to these particulars, which are: 1. Faith. 2. Repentance and obedience. 3. Justice. 4. Peace and unity. 5. Charity and beneficence. 6. Pardoning of offences. 7. Lastly, men's behaviour at the time of communicating, and afterwards; which I shall chiefly represent in the words of St. Chrysostom, who has spoken so largely upon this subject. And, first, with respect to faith, they required in every communicant, that was of years of discretion, not only an orthodox profession of the several articles of the Christian faith in general, but also a particular faith with relation to the mystical eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood in the holy sacrament. The former is evident from that usual form of words in the deacon's admonition to all that had not a right to communi-

^t Chrysostom. in Psalm. cxxxiii. p. 487, D. (tom. iii. p. 424, edit. Francof.) Πίσης ἰνέησον ἁγιωσύνης σοι διὲ τῇ πολλῇ μίζονα σύμβολα διζαμένα, ὃν ἰδίεσθαι τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων τότι. Οὐ γὰρ χερουδίμ ἔχουσ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν τῶν χερουδίμ δισπότην ἔχουσ ἰνικοῦντα, οὐδὲ στάμνον καὶ μάννα, καὶ πλάκας λιθίνας, καὶ ῥάβδον Ααρὼν, ἀλλὰ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα δισποτικὸν, καὶ πνεῦμα ἀντὶ τοῦ γράμματος, καὶ χάριν ὑπερβαίνουσαν λογισμὸν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ δωρεὰν ἀνικλήγητον. ὅσα δὲ μιζόνων ἡξιώθης συμβόλων, καὶ φρικτῶν μυστηρίων, τοσούτῃ μίζονας εἰ ὑπὸ ὕμνος τῆς ἁγιωσύνης, καὶ πλείους κολάσεως, εἰ παραβαίης τὰ ἱπτισταγμένα. — Vide sis Hom. xlvii. in 1 Cor. p. 536, (pp. 298, 299, edit. cit.) et Hom. xvii. ad Hebr. 1872, (p. 845, fin. seq. edit. cit.)

cate, to withdraw ; among whom all heterodox or heretical persons were admonished to be gone : *Μή τις τῶν ἑτεροδόξων*, 'Let no heterodox person be present.' And in regard to this, St. Chrysostom,^u or whoever was the author of the sermon of binding and loosing sin, speaking of men's private examination of themselves, says, "God hath given thee the power of binding and loosing. Thou hast bound thyself with the chain of covetousness ; loose thyself with the injunction of the love of poverty. Thou hast bound thyself with the furious desire of pleasure ; loose thyself by temperance. Thou hast bound thyself with the heterodox belief of Eunomius ; loose thyself with the religious embracing of the orthodox faith." But they did not only require an orthodox faith in general, but a particular faith with respect to the sacrament itself, teaching men, not the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation ; but that, under the visible elements of bread and wine, sanctified by the Spirit, the worthy communicant, by faith, might receive the spiritual food of Christ's body and blood, and all the blessed effects and benefits of his death and passion. To this purpose, they required men to come with the mouth of faith, spiritually to eat Christ's flesh and blood ; and to see him sacrificed with the eyes of their mind ; whilst his real bloody sacrifice, once offered, was daily represented and commemorated in the visible images and symbols of bread and wine. St. Austin is very copious in setting forth this necessary doctrine of spiritual manducation by faith, as that which makes both sense and piety of so many expressions in the Gospel, which otherwise would seem horrible and absurd. Explaining those words of our Saviour, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," he says,^x "This seems to

^u Chrysostom. Hom. in illud, Quodcumque ligaveritis, tom. vii. edit. Savil. p. 268, lin. 31, seq. *Σὺ ἰδὼς τῆς ἰξουσίας τοῦ δις μιῖν καὶ λύειν αὐτὸν ἰδεσθαι τῇ σιμῇ τῆς φιλαργυρίας. αὐτὸν λύσει τῇ ἰστολῇ τῆς φιλοπτωχίας. αὐτὸν ἰδεσθαι τῇ ὁσσερῇ τῶν ἡδονῶν αὐτὸν λύσει τῇ σωφροσύνῃ. αὐτὸν ἰδεσθαι τῇ Εὐνομίᾳ κακοπιστίας αὐτὸν λύσει τῇ τῆς ὁρθοδοξίας ὡσιείᾳ.*

^x Aug. de Doct. Christ. lib. iii. c. xvi. (tom. ii. opp. p. 53, edit. Basil. 1569.) *Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere : figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter reconducendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixæ et vulnerata sit.* (Vol. iii. p. 40, B.)

command a crime. Therefore it is a figurative speech, commanding us to communicate in the passion of our Lord, and with pleasure and profit to lay it up in our minds, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for our transgressions." So again, he brings in our Saviour telling his disciples,[†] "Ye are not to eat this body which ye see, and drink that blood which my crucifiers shall shed. But I have commended to you a certain sacrament, which, being spiritually understood, will quicken you; and though it be celebrated visibly, it is invisibly or spiritually to be understood:" meaning this faith, with which the body of Christ was to be received, to make it spiritually and really the true body, and life to the receiver. For the true body of Christ could no otherways be eaten but spiritually by faith,[‡] whilst it was really absent in heaven. The hand could not reach that body, nor the teeth consume it; but faith could ascend up to heaven,[§] and there touch the body of Christ; and with the heart it might be eaten, though not with the teeth and oral manducation. This is, therefore, that special faith which the ancients so often require in every pious communicant, to qualify him to eat the flesh of Christ to life and salvation; a faith whereby, in heart, he ascends to heaven (according to the usual phrase of the Church in her sacramental prayers, *Sursum corda*, 'Lift up your hearts'; "We lift them up unto the Lord"); and whereby he receives the real body of Christ by spiritual eating, which no wicked man can receive, though he receive the sacrament of his body both in his hand and

[†] Aug. in Psalm. xlviii. tom. viii. p. 452, (p. 1105, cit. edit. Basil.) Non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi estis; et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi, spiritaliter intellectum vivificabit vos. Et si necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi. (Bened. vol. iv. p. 800.)

[‡] Ibid. Serm. ii. de Verb. Apostol. tom. x. 94, (p. 250, edit. cit.) Manduca vitam, bibe vitam: habebis vitam, et integra est vita. Tunc autem hoc erit, id est, vita unicuique erit corpus et sanguis Christi; si, quod in sacramento visibiliter sumitur, in ipsa veritate spiritaliter manducetur, spiritaliter bibatur. (v. 447, A.) — Id. Tract. xxvi. in Joan. tom. ix. p. 94, (p. 228, d. edit. cit.) Qui manducet intus, non qui manducat foris; qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente.

[§] Ibid. Tract. i. in 1 Joan. p. 236, (p. 577, edit. cit.) Ipsum jam in cœlo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus, sed fide contingere.

mouth to his condemnation. Therefore St. Austin bids all communicants prepare their heart,^b and not their mouths, to eat "The bread of life, which came down from heaven." And St. Chrysostom calls upon them^c "to imitate eagles, and fly up to heaven. For 'where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together,' says our Saviour; calling his body the carcass, because of death. For if he had not fallen, we had not risen. But he calls us eagles; shewing, that he that comes to this body, ought to soar aloft, and have nothing to do with the earth, nor move downward and creep upon the ground, but always to fly upward, and look to the Sun of Righteousness, and have the eyes of his mind quicksighted. For this table is the table of eagles, not of jackdaws. And they who thus worthily receive him, may expect to meet him, when he shall come down again from heaven."

SECT. IX. — *What Purity of Soul by Repentance and Obedience. How far Fasting useful or necessary to this Purpose.*

2. But St. Chrysostom observes,^d that to come unto Christ by faith, is not barely to receive him in the outward element, but to touch him with a pure heart. And, therefore, he discourses excellently upon this most necessary part of preparation, to some who put great confidence in their observation of the Lent fast, as if that were a just preparation for

^b Aug. Sermon. xxxiii. de Verb. Dom. p. 50, (p. 128, edit. Basil.) Noli parare fauces sed cor, &c. (v. 394, E.)

^c Chrysostom. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. p. 536, (p. 260, edit. Francof.) Προσώμουν τῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐνότητά τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς διατηροῦμεν· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῶς ἡ θυσία ἐκινήθη ἐν ἡμῶν καὶ φοβερὰ καὶ φοβερὰ, καὶ οὐκ ἐμὴν ἐμὴν αὐτῇ μάλιστα προσεῖναι καὶ θιγεῖν ἀγάπης, καὶ αὐτοὺς γινώσκοντας ἐνταῦθα, οὕτως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἵστασθαι τὸν οὐρανόν· ὅπου γὰρ τὸ πτωμα, φησιν, ἐκί καὶ οἱ αἰετοί. πτωμα καλὸν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον· εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐκείνος ἵσταται, ἡμῶς οὐκ ἐνίσταμεν· αἰετοὺς δὲ καλῶν, δικνύς, ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι διὰ τὸν προσεῖναι τῷ σώματι τούτῳ, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν κοινὸν ἔχειν, μηδὲ κάτω εὐρίσθαι καὶ ἔρπειν, ἀλλ' ἂν πιστεῖσθαι δυνακῶς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἵστασθαι, καὶ ἐξουδενεῖν τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας ἔχειν αἰτῶν γὰρ, οὐ κοινοῦν, αὕτη ἡ τεράστια· οὕτως καὶ τότε ἀπαντήσονται ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καταβαίνοντες, εἰ οὐκ ἀξίως ἀπολαύοντες.

^d Ibid. Hom. li. in Matth. p. 454, B. (p. 554, edit. cit.) Τὸ δὲ προσεῖναι μὴ τὰ πίστεως, οὐ τὸ λαβεῖν ἵσθαι μόνον τὸ προσεῖναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μὴ τὰ καθαρὰς καρδίας ἀφαισθαι.

the communion. "Let us give up ourselves," says he,* "to the practice of virtue. For at this end aims all our fasting, and Lent, and religious assemblies so many days together; and our hearing, and prayers, and preaching; that, by these exercises, we may wash away the guilt and stain of whatever sins we have anyways contracted during the whole year, and so come, with piety and spiritual assurance, to partake of that unbloody sacrifice. But if we do not thus purify ourselves, all that other labour is in vain and to no purpose; we reap not the least advantage from it. Let every one, therefore, consider with himself, and examine in his account, what defect he has amended, what virtue he has acquired, what vice he has washed away, in what part he is grown better: and if he finds any considerable advantage of this kind arise from his fasting, and that many of his wounds have been cured by it, let him come: but if he has been negligent, and has nothing to shew but his fasting, without any other goodness or amendment, let him keep off and abide without; and then come when he has purged himself from all his sins. Let no man place his confidence in fasting only, who adheres to his sins without amendment. For it is

* Chrysostom. Hom. xxii. de Simulate, 276, B. (tom. i. p. 245, edit. Francof. 1697.) Οὐκ οὖν καὶ ἡμῖς πρὸς πλείονα ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιδιδόμεν ἀρετῇ. ὥσπερ γὰρ οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῶν πολλῶν διαύλων τοῖς τρέχουσιν, ἂν τῶν βραδείων ἐκπίσωσιν οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡμῖν ἴσται τι κέρδος ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν πόνων καὶ ἰδρώτων τῶν περὶ τὴν νηστείαν, ἰὰν μὴ μετὰ καθαροῦ συνιδότος δυνηθῶμεν τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀπολαῦσαι τραπέζης. διὰ τοῦτο νηστεία καὶ τισσαραιωσὶς, καὶ τοσούτων ἡμερῶν σύναξις, καὶ ἀπείρασις, καὶ εὐχαί, καὶ διδασκαλίαι, ἵνα παντὶ τρόπῳ τὰ παρὰ πάντα τὸν ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν ἁμαρτήματα προστεθεινὰ διὰ τῆς σπουδῆς ταύτης τῶν θείων ἐνταλμάτων ἀποσημειώμενοι, μετὰ παύσεως πνευματικῆς μετασχωμεν ὑλασθῶς τῆς ἀναιμάκτου ἐκείνης Δυσίας, ὥς ἂν μὴ ταῦτο ἢ, μάστιγι καὶ εἰκῇ καὶ ἰσ' οὐδενὶ χρησίμῳ τὸν τοσούτον ὑπόστημι πόνον. ἵναστος τοίνυν ἀναλογισθῶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ, ποῖον ἰλάττωμα διώρωσις, ποῖον κατόρθωμα προσεκτήσατο, ποῖαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνείνυστο, κατὰ τί βελτίων ἐγένετο· πᾶν μὲν εὖ ἐρηπλίον τι γινόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς νηστείας ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς τὴν καλὴν ταύτην ἱκανορίαν, καὶ συνίδην πολλὴν ἑαυτοῦ πεισιμαίνοῦ τῶν τραυμάτων τῇ ἐπιμίλειαν, προσερχέσθω· εἰ δὲ ἡμιλημένους ἔμεινεν, νηστείας μόνον ἔχων ἐπιδείξασθαι, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων οὐδὲν καταβεβηκώς, ἔξω μείνω, καὶ τότε εἰσὶν, ὅταν ἅπαντα ἐκκαθήρῃ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. τὸν μὲν γὰρ μὴ νηστεύοντα εἰς καὶ συγγνώμης τυχεῖν, σώματος ἀσθίνειαν προκαλλόμενον· τὸν δὲ μὴ διορθώσαντα ἑαυτοῦ πλημμελήματα ἀμύχανον ἀπολογίας τυχεῖν. οὐκ ἐνῆστυσας διὰ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς ἀσθίνειαν· τοῖς ἰσχυροῖς σου τιος ἔνικεν οὐ κατὰλλαγης, εἰπὶ μοι· μὴ καὶ ἐν ταῦτα ἀσθίνειαν σώματος προκαλέσθαι· ἔχεις· πάλιν ἂν βασιλευσάναι καὶ φθόνον μίσην ἔχων, ποῖαν ἔξεις ἀπολογίαν, εἰπὶ μοι· οὐδαμῶς γὰρ ἐν ταῦτοις λατάντασιν ἰσὶ σώματος ἀσθίνειαν ἴσται καταφυγεῖν.

possible a man that does not fast, may obtain pardon, having the excuse of bodily infirmity: but he that does not correct his faults, cannot possibly have any excuse. Thou hast omitted to fast, by reason of the infirmity of thy flesh: but why hast thou not been reconciled to thy enemies? Canst thou here pretend bodily infirmity also? Thou still retainest hatred and envy: what excuse, I pray, canst thou plead for these? There is no flying for refuge to bodily infirmity in behalf of such sins as these." Thus Chrysostom shews the necessity of correcting every evil way, in thought, word, and deed, in order to prepare men for a worthy reception at God's table; and that no pretences of other qualifications, without holiness, nor any excuses for sin, will be accepted, while Christ has made his commandments very practicable, and recommended his yoke as easy, and his burden as light.

SECT. X.—*How necessary Justice and Restitution to a worthy Communicant.*

3. And because there are some great sins, to which men have a more than ordinary propensity and affection, and are ready to find out a thousand arts to palliate and retain them with a semblance of piety and pretended devotion; the same author is always very careful to particularize about these in men's preparation, pulling off the vizard and false colours they were apt to lay upon them. Thus, in the case of injustice, many were inclined to impose upon themselves by that old Pharisaical pretence of giving something to the corban, to make a full atonement, as they thought, for their manifold rapines and oppression. Whom he thus reproves, and lays open their folly.^f "Let no Judas, no Simon Magus, come near this table: for they both perished in their avarice and love of money. Wherefore, let us fly from this pit, and not imagine it sufficient for our salvation, that when we have spoiled widows and orphans, we offer a golden cup, adorned

^f Chrysostom. Hom. li. in Matth. p. 455, A. (p. 555, edit. Francof.) Μηδεις Ἰουδας ταύτη προσίτω τῇ τραπέζῃ, μηδεις Σίμων· καὶ γὰρ ἀμφοτέρωι διὰ φιλαργυρίαν ἀπώλοντο οὗτοι· φύγωμεν τοίνυν τοῦτα τὰ βάραθρον, μηδὲ νομίζομεν ἑκαὺν εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ χήρας καὶ ὀρφανούς ἀποδύσαντες, ποτήριον χρυσοῦν καὶ λιθοκόλληταιν

with jewels, to this table. Wouldst thou honour this sacrifice? Offer thy soul, for which Christ was offered, and make it a golden soul. But if thy soul remain worse than lead or earth, what will thy golden vessels profit thee? Let us not, therefore, labour to offer golden vessels only, but offer what we acquire by our just and honest labour. For these are more precious than gold, which are not the fruits of covetousness and injustice. The Church is not the work-house of silver and gold, but the congregation of angels; therefore the purity of our souls is required: for God receives these things upon the account of our souls. Doubtless that table was not of silver, nor that cup of gold, wherein Christ gave his blood to his disciples: yet all was precious and full of reverence, because they were filled with the Spirit." St. Chrysostom speaks this to men's own consciences, in private, who knew their own extortions, when, perhaps, the Church knew nothing of them; and he lays upon them the necessity of justice and restitution in their private accounts with God, before they could hope to gain his favour, or be accepted at his altar. For as to public offences of this kind, we have noted before,^s that when they were such as the Church could take cognizance of, they fell under her public discipline; and it was a standing law, that the oblations of known oppressors should not be received, much less their persons, to the communion of the altar.

SECT. XI. — *The Necessity of Peace and Unity.*

4. Another thing they much insisted on, was unity and a peaceable spirit: by which they chiefly intended that sort of peaceableness which preserves the unity of the Church, not

προσπίνγκωμιν τῇ τραπέζῃ· εἰ γὰρ βούλει τιμῆσαι τὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ψυχὴν προσπίγκει, δι' ἣν καὶ ἰδύθη ταύτην χρυσὴν ποίησαν· ἂν δὲ αὕτη μίση μολίσκου καὶ ἰστέρεου χιρίων, τὸ δὲ σκυῖος χρυσῶν, τί τὸ κέρδος; μὴ τοῖνυν τοῦτο σκοπῶμεν, ὅπως χρυσᾷ σκυῖᾳ προσφέρωμεν μόνον, ἀλλ' ὅπως καὶ ἐκ δικαίων πότνων· ταῦτα γὰρ ἴσται τὰ καὶ χρυσῶν τιμιώτερα, τὰ χωρὶς πλεονεξίας· οὐ γὰρ χρυσοχοῖον, οὐδὲ ἀργυροκοπιὴν ἴσται ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ πανήγυρις ἀγγέλων· δι' ἃ ψυχῶν ἡμῖν δι' καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα διὰ τὰς ψυχὰς προσπίπτει ὁ Θεός· οὐκ ἦν ἡ τραπέζα ἐξ ἀργύρου τότε ἱκίνητη, οὐδὲ τὸ ποτήριον χρυσῶν, ἐξ οὗ ἴδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ· ἀλλὰ τίμια ἦν καὶ φεικτὰ, ἱκετὴ πνεύματος ἔγινεν. — Id. Hom. lxxxvi. p. 722, cit. c. ii. sect. ii. sub litt. (J), p. 28.

^s Book xv. chap. ii. sect. ii.

only in opposition to formed and professed schisms, but all factions and divisions within the bosom of the Church. As to formal and professed schismatics, they were objects of the public discipline, and not to be admitted to communion without public recantation and formal renouncing of their errors. But besides these, there were another sort of turbulent spirits, who, without breaking forth into professed separations, were often the occasion of great tumults and disquiet in the Church. Such were those Corinthians, whom the apostle so often rebukes for their factious zeal and unnecessary disputations and contentions one with another; which proceeded from many evil causes, and were attended with as bad effects. For they sprung from the bitter roots of envy, and pride, and ambition, and covetousness, and self-interest, and self-love, and a blind, or else crafty and designing, admiration of one teacher above another. "For one said, I am of Paul; and another, I of Apollos; I of Cephas; and I of Christ." And the effects were debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults. Inso-much, that in their sidings and partyings, they came to express a disdain and contempt of one another, in that which should have taught them the quite contrary lesson, the celebration of the Lord's supper and their feasts of charity. For, in eating, every one took, before others, his own supper: and one was hungry, and another was drunken. Upon which the apostle gave them that most solemn admonition, (1 Cor. xi. 28). "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." It was not long after St. Paul's death, that Clemens, bishop of Rome, had occasion to write a long epistle to these Corinthians upon the very same subject of their seditious factions and divisions; where, among many other arguments to persuade them to unity and peace, he bids them beware,^h "That the manifold blessings of God did not turn to their con-

^h Clem. Rom. Epist. i. ad Corinth. sect. xxi. 'Ορᾶσι, μὴ αἱ ἐνεργείαι αὐτοῦ αἱ πολλαὶ γίνονται εἰς κέρμα πᾶσιν ἡμῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἀξίως αὐτοῦ πολιτευόμενοι τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἐνέργετα ἰσώπειον αὐτοῦ ποιῶμεν μὲθ' ὁμοιοίας. (Oxon. 1838, i. 86.)

demnation, if they walked unworthy of him, and neglected to do what was good and pleasing in his sight, with unanimity and concord." Therefore he bids them,ⁱ "Quickly remove this evil, and fall down before the Lord, and weep and pray to him, that he would be merciful and reconciled to them, and reduce and restore them to the pure and comely way of brotherly love. For this is the gate of righteousness which opens into life. Charity unites us unto God;^j charity covers a multitude of sins; charity beareth all things; charity has nothing of pride or baseness in it; charity has no schism; charity raises no sedition; charity does all things in concord. By charity, all the elect of God are made perfect; without charity, nothing is acceptable unto God." Therefore, he advises the ringleaders of the sedition, and the heads of faction, to be subject to their rulers, and repent; and to lay aside all arrogant and proud boasting of the tongue; since it was better to be found little and approved in the fold of Christ, than to be high-minded and rejected from the hope of his kingdom. He bids them sacrifice their own interest to the peace of the Church.^k "Who among you is of a noble and generous temper?^l Who has any bowels of compassion? Who is filled with charity? Let him say, 'If upon my account there be sedition, and discord,

ⁱ Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. n. xlviii. 'Εξάρουμεν τοῦτο ἐν τάχει, καὶ προσπίσωμεν τῷ Διεσπότη, καὶ κλαύσωμεν ἰκτινύοντες αὐτὸν, ὅπως ἴλιως γινόμενος ἱκαναταλλαγῇ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν σιμὴν τῆς φιλαδελφίας ἡμῶν ἀγὴν ἀγωγὴν ἀποκαταστήσῃ ἡμᾶς· πύλη γὰρ δικαιοσύνης ἀνιργυῖα εἰς ζωὴν αὐτῇ. (P. 168.)

^j Ibid. n. xlix. 'Αγάπη κολλᾷ ἡμᾶς τῷ Θεῷ, ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, ἀγάπη πάντα ἀνέχεται, πάντα μακροθυμεῖ· οὐδὲν βάνουσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, οὐδὲν ὑπερέφθαιον· ἀγάπη σχίσμα οὐκ ἔχει, ἀγάπη οὐ στασιάζει, ἀγάπη πάντα ποιῇ ἐν ἁρμοσίᾳ· ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐπιλυώθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· δίχα ἀγάπης οὐδὲν εὐάριστόν ἐστιν τῷ Θεῷ. (P. 172.)

^k Ibid. n. lvii. 'Υμῖς οἱ τὴν καταβολὴν [τῆς] στάσεως ποιήσαντες, ὑποτάγητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ παιδεύητε εἰς μετένοιαν κάμφαντες τὰ γόνατα τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, μάθετε ὑποτάσσεσθαι, ἀποθίμινον τὴν ἀλάζονα καὶ ὑπερέφθαιον τῆς γλώσσης ὑμῶν αὐθάδεια· ἡμεῖνοι γὰρ ἐσθιν ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ποιμνίᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μικροῦς καὶ ἰλλογίμου ἐνέβηται, ἢ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν δοκούντας ἐκρεψῆναι ἐκ τῆς ἱλπίδος αὐτοῦ. (P. 194.)

^l Ibid. n. liv. Τίς οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν γυναιὸς; τίς εὐσπλαγχνος; τίς πικροφρονημένος ἀγάπης; εἰπάτω, Εἰ δ' ἰμὲν στάσις, καὶ ἔρις, καὶ σχίσματα, ἐκχωρῶ, ἄπιμι οὐδ' ἐὰν βούλησθι, καὶ ποιῶ τὰ προστασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους· μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐρηπνύω, μὴτὰ τῶν καθισταμένων πρεσβυτέρων. Τοῦτο ὁ ποιήσας ἑαυτῷ μίγα κλίος ἐν Κυρίῳ περιποιήσεται, καὶ πᾶς τόπος δίδεται αὐτόν· τοῦ γὰρ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλῆρωμα αὐτῆς. (P. 184.)

and schism ; I will willingly depart, and go away whithersoever you please ; I will do what the people command me : only let the fold of Christ be in peace under the elders that are set over them.' He that does this, shall purchase to himself great honour in the Lord, and every place will receive him. 'For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.' Thus did that holy man exhort the seditious Corinthians to lay aside their factious and turbulent spirit, and betake themselves to the ways of unity and peace, as ever they hoped to find mercy and favour at the hands of the Lord. And the ancients generally use this argument against uncharitable strife and contention, and schism and division, that they are crimes of that magnitude, that without repentance, even the blood of martyrdom will not wash away and blot out the stain and guilt of them. Which is a noted saying of Cyprian's,^m repeated and approved by Chrysostom,ⁿ St. Austin,^o Fulgentius,^p and many others.

SECT. XII.—*Of Charity and Mercy to the Poor.*

5. Another thing they much recommended as a necessary qualification in a worthy communicant, was the exercise of beneficence and charity to the indigent, especially to the poor members of Christ. For when they themselves were

^m Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. p. 113, (p. 81, fin. edit. Amstelod.) Quam sibi pacem promittunt inimici fratrum ? quæ sacrificia celebrare se credunt æmulli sacerdotum ? an secum esse Christum, quum collecti fuerint, opinantur, qui extra Christi ecclesiam colliguntur ? Tales etiam occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur. Inexpiabilia et gravis culpa discordiæ nec passione purgatur. Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est, &c.

ⁿ Chrysostom. Hom. xi. in Ephes. p. 1107, (p. 958, edit. Francof.) 'Ανὴρ τις ἄγιος ἐπὶ τι δακνὸν εἶναι τολμηρὸν, πλὴν ἄλλ' ἡμῶς ἐφθίγγατο· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ἴσται, οὐδὲ μαρτυρίαν αἶμα ταύτης δύνασθαι ἱεραλείῃν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἔφησιν.

^o Aug. de Bapt. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. xvii. (tom. vii. opp. p. 428, edit. Basil. 1569.) Quod si propter hoc, quia caritas deest, passio nihil prodest ; nec illis prodest, quos in invidia intus et malevolentia sine caritate vivere Paulus dicit, Cyprianus exponit : &c. (ix. 91, D.)

^p Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, c. xxxix. (inter Opera Aug. tom. iii. p. 234.) Omni homini qui ecclesiæ Catholicæ non tenet unitatem, neque baptismus, neque eleemosyna quamlibet copiosa, neque mors pro nomine Christi suscepta, proficere poterit ad salutem, quamdiu in eo hæretica vel schismatica pravitas perseverat, quæ ducit ad mortem.

about to receive the greatest blessings in the world, they thought it but reasonable that they should shew kindness, according to their ability, to his and their brethren. This was the foundation of their oblations and love-feasts mentioned before; and the neglect, or abuse, or partiality, used in them, was always reputed a capital misdemeanour. But this was not all: they not only required men to be charitable in the act of communicating, but at all times; and allowed not the most plausible pretences that could be offered to the contrary. Some apologized for their uncharitableness, as they did for their injustice; they wiped their mouths, and cried out *corban*, "It is a gift to Christ, wherewith thou mightest be profited by me:" and so they thought themselves discharged by commutation: they gave to God's use some gift which he required not, and let the poor perish, whom he had commanded them to sustain. To these St. Chrysostom thus elegantly discourses:^a "Would you honour the body of Christ? Do not then despise him when he is naked. Do not honour him here in the church with vestments of silk; and neglect him without doors, when ready to perish with cold and nakedness. For he that said, 'This is my body,' and confirmed the thing with his word, said also, 'Ye saw me a hungered, and fed me not:' and, 'Forasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me.' For this body of Christ [the eucharist] needs no clothing, but a pure mind: but that other body of his needs much of our care. Therefore let us learn to be wise, and honour Christ according to his own will. Give him that honour which he has commanded; distribute your riches among the

^a Chrysostom. Hom. li. in Matth. p. 455, C. (p. 555, edit. Francof.) Βούλου σιμῆσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ σῶμα, μὴ περιῶδες αὐτὸν γυμνόν· μηδὲ ἰνταῦθα μὴ αὐτὸν σκεπτικῶς ἱματίως τιμάσης. ἔγω δὲ ὑπὸ περιούου καὶ γυμνότητος διαφθιρέμενος περιῶδες· ὁ γὰρ εἰσὼν, Τούτῳ μου ἰστί τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τῇ λόγῳ τὸ πρᾶγμα βεβαιώσας, οὕτως ἔπει, Παντόντῳ με ἴσται, καὶ οὐκ ἰδρίψεται· καὶ, Ἐφ' ἧσιν οὐκ ἰκαίησται ἰνὶ ταύτῳ τῶν ἰλαχίστων, οὐδὲ ἱμῶ ἱσαίησται· ταῦτο γὰρ οὐ δῖται ἱσιγλημάτων, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς καθαρεῖς· ἱκεῖνο δὲ πολλῆς δῖται ἱσιμιλίας· μάθωμεν τοίνυν φιλοσοφίῃ, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν σιμᾶν ὡς αὐτὸς βούλεται· τῇ γὰρ σιμουμένην τιμὴν ἡδίστη, ἣν αὐτὸς δίδου, ὅχι ἣν ἡμῖς ναιμίζομεν· ἱπὶ καὶ Πίτρος σιμᾶν αὐτὸν φῖτο τῇ καλύσαι νίψαι τοὺς πόδας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν σιμᾶν τὸ γινώμενον, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον· οὕτω καὶ σὺ ταύτην αὐτὸν σῶμα σὴν σιμᾶν, ἣν αὐτὸς ἱεροθέτησεν, εἰς πίνητας ἀναλίσκων τὸν πλοῦτον· οὐδὲ γὰρ σιωπῶν χρεῖαν ἔχει χρυσῶν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ ψυχῶν χρυσῶν καὶ ταῦτα λίγω, οὐ

poor. God has no need of golden vessels, but of golden souls. I say not this, to forbid any man to offer such gifts; but because I judge it proper, together with these, and before these, to do works of charity. For God indeed receives these, but the other are much more acceptable to him. Vessels only profit him that offers them; but works of charity profit both the giver and the receiver. The one is often an occasion of ostentation, but the other is all humanity and mercy. What profit is it to Christ, that his table is filled with golden cups, whilst he himself is famished by want? Therefore first feed him when he is hungry; and then of your superfluity and abundance adorn his table. You make him a golden cup, but will not give him a cup of cold water. What does this profit him? You prepare coverings for his table, embroidered with gold; but he himself is naked, and you cover him not with necessary clothing. What advantage is there in all this? Tell me, I pray: suppose you should see a man want necessary food, and you, instead of relieving his hunger, should only adorn his table with gold: would he take this as any kindness, and not rather look upon it with indignation? Or, if you saw a man clothed in rags, and frozen with cold, and you, instead of giving him raiment, should erect golden pillars, and say, you did it for his honour; would he not rather say you mocked him, and think you put the greatest affront imaginable upon him? You may apprehend the case to be the very same with Christ: when he wanders about as a stranger, having no house to cover his head, then thou neglectest to take him in; thou contemnest his person, but

πωλὼν ἀναθήματα κατασκευάζεσθαι τοιαῦτα· ἀξίων δὲ μετὰ τούτων, καὶ πρὸ τούτων, τὴν ἐλιημοσύνην ποιῶν· δίχεται μὲν γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα· πολλὰ μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκείνα· ἵνα αὐτὰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ προσεγγὼν ἀφιλήσῃ μόνον· ἐκὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ λαβὼν ἵνα αὐτὰ δοκῇ καὶ φιλοτιμίαις ἀφορμὴ τὸ πρῶγμα εἶναι· ἐκὶ δὲ ἐλιημοσύνη καὶ φιλασθενοσύνη τὸ πᾶν ἴσσι· τί γὰρ ὄφελος, ὅτ' εἴ τις τράπεζα αὐτῶν γίμῃ χερσῶν ποτηρίων, αὐτοὺς δὲ λιμῶ διαφθείρεται; πρῆτιον αὐτὸν ἱμῶν πεινῶντα, καὶ τότε ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τὴν τραπέζαν αὐτοῦ κόσμῳ ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ποιεῖς, καὶ ποτήριον ψυχροῦν αὐτῷ δίδως; καὶ τί τὸ ὄφελος χρυσόπαστα ἐπιστήματα κατασκευάζειν τῇ τραπέζῃ αὐτῶν δὲ μηδὲ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν παρίχην σκέπῃ. καὶ τί τὸ κέρδος ἐκ τούτου; Εἰπέ γάρ μοι· εἴ τινα ἰδὼν τῆς ἀναγκαιῆς ἀποροῦντα τραφῇς, ἀφίεις αὐτῶν λύσαι τὸν λιμῶν, τὴν τραπέζαν ἀργύρῳ περιέβαλλας μόνον· ἄρα εἴ τις ἴγνω σοι χάριν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἡγαπάκηται; τί δὲ εἰ βέλκιοι περιέβλημένοι ἱερῶν, καὶ ὑπὸ κρυμοῦ πηγνύμηναι, ἀφίεις αὐτῶν δοῦναι ἱμάτιον,

beautifiest his pavement and his walls, and the heads of his pillars : thou makest his lamps to hang on silver chains, but wilt not vouchsafe to visit him when he is chained in prison. I speak not this to prohibit thee from doing these things, but to excite thee to do the other together with them, or rather before them. For no man was ever condemned for not building magnificent temples ; but, for neglecting the poor, hell is threatened, and the fire that shall never be quenched, and punishment with devils. Whilst, therefore, you adorn God's house, do not neglect your afflicted brother. For he is more properly the temple of God than the other. For those may be plundered of all their treasure by infidel kings, and tyrants, and thieves : but what thou dost to a brother that is hungry, or a stranger, or naked, the devil himself cannot rob thee of, but is laid up in a safe repository, where no violence can make a prey of it." It were easy to give the reader many other such affecting passages out of Chrysostom^r and others ; but this one is sufficient to shew what stress they laid upon charity or beneficence to the poor, in order to qualify men for a worthy reception of the holy communion.

SECT. XIII.—*Of Charity in forgiving Enemies, and pardoning Offences.*

6. But this was not the only kind of charity they required to be exercised upon this occasion. There was another more difficult to be practised, and yet no less necessary to be

κίνας κατασκινύζεις χρυσοῦς, λίγων εἰς ἐκείνου τιμὴν ποιῶν· οὐκ ἂν σε καὶ ἐργασθῆαι ἔφη, καὶ ὕβριν ἰνόμεσι ταύτην ἰσχύατην ; τοῦτο καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λογιζέου, ὅτ' ἂν ἀλήτης καὶ ἕξιος περιέρχηται διόμενος ὀροφῆς· σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἀφίεις ὑποδέχασθαι ἰθαφες παλλωνπίζεις, καὶ τοίχους καὶ κίονων κεφαλὰς, καὶ ἀργυροῦς ἀλύσεις διὰ λαμπάδων ἑξάπτεις, αὐτὸν δὲ ἰν δισμωτηρίῳ διδιμένον μὴδὲ ἰδίῳ ἰδίλεις. Καὶ ταῦτα λίγω, οὐχὶ κωλύων καὶ ἰν τούτους φιλοτμύσθαι· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πρὸς ἐκείνων παραινῶν ποιῶν. Ὑπὲρ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ ταῦτα μὴ ποιῆσαι, οὐδεὶς ἐνικλήθη ποτὶ' ὑπὲρ δὲ ἐκείνων καὶ γίνεσθαι ἠπειλήσεται, καὶ πῦρ ἄσβεστον, καὶ ἡ μιστὰ δαιμόνων τιμωρία· μὴ τοίνυν οἶκον κοσμῶν, τὸν ἀδελφὸν θλιβόμενον περιέχε· οὗτος γὰρ ἐκείνου ὁ ναὶς κυριώτερος. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ βασιλεῖς ἄπιστοι, καὶ τύραννοι, καὶ λησται δυνήσονται λαβεῖν τὰ κειμήλια· ὅσα δὲ ἂν εἰς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ποιήσης πεινῶντα καὶ ἕξιον ὄντα, καὶ γυμνὸν, οὐδὲ ἰ διὰ βολος συλῆσαι δυνήσεται, ἀλλ' ἰν ἀσύλῳ κίεσται θησαυρῷ.

^r Vide sis Chrysostom. Hom. i. in 1 Timoth. p. 1631 ; Hom. ix. de Pœnit. tom. i. p. 704 ; Hom. xxv. tom. v. p. 369.

performed by all that would lay any just claim to the mercy of God in the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood : and that was the duty of pardoning and forgiving enemies, without which it was absurd and imprudent to presume to ask God pardon at the holy table : therefore St. Chrysostom, explaining those words of our Saviour (Matt. v.), " If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way : first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift," says,* " By all this Christ intended to signify, that the holy table would not receive men that were at enmity with one another : no, nor yet could they so much as offer their prayers acceptably to God. Therefore hear this," says he, " all ye that are initiated in the holy mysteries, and come not in enmity to the communion of the altar. Let them also hear it, who are not yet initiated, for they have a common concern in these words also. For they offer, likewise, their gifts and their sacrifice, I mean their prayers and their alms, which the Psalmist often calls sacrifice, ' The sacrifice of praise shall honour me : ' and, ' Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise : ' and, ' Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening-sacrifice.' " Whence he concludes, that if a man come to pray with such a mind, he had better leave his prayers, and go first and be reconciled to his brother, and then come and offer his prayers. It is usual with Chrysostom, upon this account, to tell his hearers,[†] that they who are unqualified for the communion, are unqualified for their prayers likewise : because they, in effect, pray to God to curse themselves, whilst they pray for forgiveness of sins only in the same manner as they forgive their enemies. " If

* Chrysostom. Hom. xvi. in Matth. p. 166, B. (p. 203, edit. Francof.) Διὰ πάντων τούτων δηλῶν, ὅτι οὐ δίκαια σοὺς ἀπεχθῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχοντας αὐτὴ ἡ τράπεζα. 'Ακουίστωσαν οἱ μισηταί, ὅτι μετὰ ἔχθρας προσέχονται' ἀκούστωσαν καὶ οἱ ἀμύητοι καὶ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἔχουσιν οἱ κοινὸν ὁ λόγος' προσάγουσι γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ δῶρον καὶ θυσίαν, εὐχὴν λόγον καὶ ἰλιμυσίνη. ὅτι γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο θυσία, ἄκουσον τί φησιν ὁ προφήτης, θυσία αἰνέσις δέξασθαι με' καὶ πάλιν, θέλει τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσις' καὶ, 'Ἐπαρσας τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἱσχυριν' ὥστε καὶ εὐχὴν μετὰ τοιαύτης γνώμης προσάγει, βίλτιον ἀφῆναι τὴν εὐχὴν, καὶ ἰπὶ τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἰλθῆν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, καὶ τότε εὐχὴν προσφέρει.

[†] Ibid. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051, (p. 888, edit. cit.) Οὐκ εἰ τῆς θυσίας ἄξιός, οὐδὲ τῆς μεταλήψεως; οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ τῆς εὐχῆς.

we have designs of revenge in our hearts," says he,^u "when we pray, we pray against ourselves, saying, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' These are terrible words, and the same as if one said to God,^v 'Lord, I have forgiven my enemy, forgive thou me: I have loosed him, loose thou me: I have pardoned my enemy, pardon me: if I have retained his sins, retain thou mine: if I have not loosed my neighbour, do not thou loose my offences: what measure I have meted to him, measure thou to me again.' " It was with this argument that he induced the people to shew mercy to their great enemy, Eutropius, when he was fled for sanctuary to the altar.^w "How will you be able to take the holy sacrament into your hands, and use the words of that prayer, wherein we are commanded to say, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us,' if you exact punishment of your debtor?" In another place he tells them,^x if they forgave their enemies, they might then come with a pure conscience to the holy and tremendous table, and boldly say the words contained in that prayer, "Forgive us, as we forgive;" but if they retained anger or malice in their hearts,^y they were no

^u Chrysostom. Hom. xxii. de Ira, tom. i. p. 255, edit. Francof. . . . καὶ λαυτοῦ τὴν εὐχὴν ταύτην ποιούμενος· ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃς, "Ἄφες ἡμῖν, ὡς καὶ ἡμῖς ἀφίμην, εἴτα σὺ μὴ ἀφῇς, οὐδὲν ἴσταν τὸν Θεὸν παρακαλεῖς, ἀλλ' ἢ πάσης ἀπολογίας ἀποστρεφῶν σε καὶ συγγνώμης.

^v Ibid. Hom. xxxviii. de Pœnit. et Euchar. tom. v. p. 570, A. (p. 509, edit. cit.) Εἰσερχόμενοι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς Θεῷ πρίντι εἰσέλθοντες, μὴ μνησικαλίαν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἔχοντες, μήπως εὐχόμενοι, καὶ λαυτῶν εὐχόμεθα, λίγοντες, "Ἄφες ἡμῖν, ὡς καὶ ἡμῖς ἀφίμην τοῖς ἐφιλίταις ἡμῶν· φοβερὸν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ λίγα μνησθῆναι, καὶ σχιδὸν εἰπεῖν, τοιοῦτο πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν βεβῆκεν εἰς τὸ λίγον, Ἀφῆκα, Δίεπατα, Ἄφες· ἔλυσα, λύσον συνεχώρησα, συγχώρησον· εἰ ἐκράτησα, κράτησον· εἰ μὴ ἔλυσα τῷ πλησίον, μὴδὲ σὺ λύσον τὰ ἐμὰ ἀμαρτήματα· ἐν ᾧ μέτρησεν ἐμὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἀνταμειβεσθῆσθαι μοι.

^w Ibid. Hom. in Eutrop. tom. iv. p. 554, D. (p. 485, edit. cit.) Πῶς τοῦ θανάτου ταύτου λυθόντες, ὑμεῖς μυστηρίον ἀψάσθε, καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐκείτη ἐκείνη, δι' ἧς καλεώμεθα λίγον, "Ἄφες ἡμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖς ἀφίμην τοῖς ἐφιλίταις ἡμῶν, τὸν ἡμῶν ἐφιλίτην ἀπαντῶντες δίκην·

^x Ibid. Hom. xxvii. in Genes. p. 358, B. (p. 300, edit. cit.) Ἄν τοῦτο κατορθώσωμεν, δυναστέμεθα μετὰ καθαροῦ συνιδότες καὶ τῇ ἱερᾷ ταύτῃ καὶ φρικτῇ τραπέζῃ προσελθόντες, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα ἐκείνα τὰ σὺν εὐχῇ συνειλεγμένα μετὰ παρήκτου φθίγγεσθαι.

^y Ibid. Hom. xxii. de Ira, tom. i. p. 277, (pp. 246, 247, edit. cit.) Ὡς γὰρ τὸν περιόυστα καὶ τὸν βλασφημούντα ἀμύχανον μετασχεῖν τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης.

fitter to partake of that holy table than fornicators, or adulterers, or blasphemers. "For how canst thou desire God to be gracious and merciful to thee, who art so implacable and
 * inexorable to thy fellow-servant? Admit he has injured and affronted thee: hast thou not often injured and affronted God? And what comparison is there betwixt the Lord and a servant? It may be also, thy fellow-servant was first injured by thee, and only returned the compliment, and payed thee in thy own kind, and thou art incensed at that: but thou, without any injury or provocation received from God, treatest him contumeliously; nay, not only when he does thee no harm, but when he daily loads thee with blessings, and continually pours forth his benefits upon thee." He adds,* that this sin of malice and revenge was the more dangerous and inexcusable, because it had none of the little pleas, which were commonly urged in the behalf of other sins, to be offered in its favour. "If I bid you fast, you plead the excuse of bodily infirmity: if I bid you give to the poor, you plead poverty yourself, and the care of your own children: if I call upon you to attend Divine worship, you pretend the avocations of worldly care and secular business: if I bid you hear sermons, and consider the power of the doctrine contained in them, you plead disability and want of learning to understand them: if I advise you to admonish and correct your brother, you tell me, he will not hearken

οὕτω τὸν ἰχθὲρὸν ἔχοντα καὶ μνησικακοῦντα ἀδύνατον ἀπολαῦσαι κοινωνίας ἀγίας
 . . . Πῶς δὲ βούλει τὸν διαπότην ἡμερόν σοι γινίσθαι καὶ πρῶον, τῇ συνδούλῳ
 γινόμενος αὐτὸς χαλσιπὸς καὶ ἀσύγγνωστος; ἀλλ' ὕβρισί σε ὁ σύνδουλος, καὶ σὺ τὸν
 Θεὸν ὕβριζεις πολλάκις. ποῦ δὲ ἴσον σύνδουλος καὶ διαπότης; καὶ αὐτὸς μὴ ἴσια μὲν
 ποῦ ἡδικημένος ἴσως ὕβρισται, καὶ παρωξύνεθ'· σὺ δὲ τὸν διαπότην ὕβριζεις οὐκ ἡδικημένος,
 οὐδὲ ἰπηρεαζόμενος, ἀλλ' ὑπεργιτούμενος καθ' ἑκάστην ὥρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡμέραν.

* Chrysostom. Hom. xxii. de Ira, tom. i. p. 282, B. (p. 252, edit. Francof.) "Ἄν
 εἶπω, Νήστινσον, ἀσθινύαν μοι προβάλλῃ σώματος πολλάκις· ἂν εἶπω, Δὲ πίνῃσι,
 παιδαγωγίαν καὶ πνίαν· ἂν εἶπω, Σχόλαζι εἰς συνάξεις, φροντίδας βιωτικὰς· ἂν εἶπω,
 Πρόσχετι τοῖς λαγομένοις, καὶ νόμι τῆς διδασκαλίας τὴν δύναμιν, ἰδιωτίαν· ἂν εἶπω,
 Κατέφθασον ἴτερον, λίγυις, ὅτι οὐχ ὑπακούει συμβουλευόμενος, πολλάκις γὰρ εἰπὼν
 κατεφροσίνεθ'· ψυχραὶ μὲν οὖν αἱ προφάσεις, ἀλλ' ὅμως κἀν προφάσει ἔχουσιν ἰπαῖν·
 ἂν εἶπω, Τὴν ἐργὴν ἄφρις· τί τούτων εἰπαῖν δυνήσῃ; οὔτε γὰρ ἀσθινύαν σώματος, οὔτε
 πνίαν, οὐκ ἰδιωτίαν, οὐκ ἀσχολίαν, οὐκ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν εἰπαῖν, ἀλλ' ἀσύγγνωστος
 αὕτη μάλιστα πάντων ἴσθιν ἡ ἁμαρτία. πῶς δυνήσῃ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
 ἀνατείνας; πῶς τὴν γλῶττιν κινήσαι; πῶς αἰτῆσαι συγγνώμην; κἀν γὰρ βούλει
 ὁ Θεὸς ἀφίνειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, οὐκ ἀφίης αὐτὸς τὰ τοῦ συνδούλου κατήχων.

to your counsel : you have admonished him, and he despises you. These are but cold excuses, yet they are excuses in some sort. But, if I bid you lay aside your anger, which of those excuses can you make? You cannot plead bodily infirmity, nor poverty, nor want of understanding, nor want of time and leisure from worldly business, nor any other such excuse ; therefore this, of all others, is a most unpardonable sin. How then will you hold up your hands to heaven, or move your tongue, or ask pardon of your sins, when, if God were disposed to pardon them, you will not suffer him to do it, while you refuse to pardon the offence of your fellow-servant? ". Having used these, and many other excellent arguments, to shew men the necessity of reconciliation and mutual forgiveness, when they came to the holy communion, which is the covenant of forgiveness, and peace with God and man ; he takes notice of two evasions, which some men used in this case to palliate and foster still something of an ill-natured temper, and make it seem consistent with their duty. Some were, indeed, afraid to say those words of the Lord's Prayer, " Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us," as being sensible it was no better than cursing themselves, while they continued in such an evil disposition ; and, therefore, they only said the first clause, " Forgive us our trespasses," and dropped the second, which contains the condition of their forgiving others ; and they were so vain as to think, this was a sufficient *salvo* to their consciences, and a security against the menaces that were threatened to a revengeful temper. To whom he replies, " This was but a vain caution : for, whether they said the words or not, God would deal with them according to their actions : Christ having told them, in the very next words, ' If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses.' " Others

^a Chrysostom. Hom. xxii. de Ira, tom. i. p. 289, (p. 257, edit. Francof.) Κἀν αὐτὸς μὴ ἰσχυρὸς, ὁ Θεὸς οὕτω ποιῶν καθὼς ἀφίης, οὕτως ἀφίησι καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς ἰπαγωγῆς εὐθελὸν ἰσχύουσιν· ἵαν γὰρ μὴ ἀφίηται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδὲ ὁ Πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ εὐεργέτης ἀφίησιν ἡμῖν. μὴ τοίνυν ἐνλάβειαν εἶναι νομίσης, τὸ μὴ λίγειν ἐλόκληρον τὴν βῆσιν, μηδὲ ἐξ ἡμισίας ποιεῖν τὴν ἐσχῆν, ἀλλ' ὥς ἴσασιν, οὕτως εὐχου, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ἀνάγκη τῆς λίξεως φοβούσα καὶ ἡμῶν συνωθήσῃ σε πρὸς τὴν τῶν συγχωρήσεων.

— A little after : (C.) Οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ, τὸ μὴ λυπεῖν, μηδὲ ἀδικεῖν τὸν ἐχθρὸν, μηδὲ

excused themselves by saying, "I bear no hatred or malice against my enemy, I am not concerned or troubled at his enmity, I will have nothing to do with him." "But," says Chrysostom, "this is not enough, that thou wilt give him no trouble, that thou wilt do him no harm, that thou wilt bear no rancorous mind against him; but thou must endeavour to restore him to a friendly temper. For God has not commanded us to have nothing to do with our enemy, but to have many things to do with him. For this reason he is our brother: and for this reason God said not, 'Forgive thy brother what thou hast against him;' but, 'Go, and be reconciled to him, if he hath ought against thee;' and cease not, till thou hast brought that member to its proper harmony and concord." He has also there these remarkable words:^b "I tell you before, I protest, I proclaim it aloud, let no man that has an enemy, come to the holy table, and receive the body of the Lord. Let no man come that has an enemy. Hast thou an enemy? come not. Wouldst thou come? Be reconciled, and then come and receive the holy body. Thy Lord, to reconcile thee to his Father, refused not to be slain, and shed his blood for thy sake: and wilt not thou speak a word, nor go to make the first offer, to reconcile thy fellow-servant?" This he says to those who thought it below them, and an act of pusillanimity and disgrace, to seem to make the first step toward reconciling an enemy, by being first in the offer and motion of peace. But

ἤδη ἔχουν πρὸς αὐτὸν κατὰ διάνοιαν, ἀλλὰ χρεὶ ἀκρίβειον παρασπινύζουσιν, ἥδιως πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔχουν. Καὶ γὰρ ἀκούω πολλῶν λεγόντων, Ἐγὼ οὐκ ἰχθρεύω, οὐδὲ λυποῦμαι, οὐδὲ ἔχω τι κοινὸν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο ἐκίλεισιν ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα κοινὸν ἔχῃς πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα πρὸς αὐτόν κοινὰ ἔχῃς πολλά· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ σου ἐστὶν ἀδελφός· διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἵπνιν, Ἀφίς τῇ ἀδελφῇ σου, α ἔχῃς κατ' αὐτοῦ· ἀλλὰ τί; Ἰταρα, πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐκείνος ἔχῃ τι κατὰ σου καὶ μὴ πρότερον ἀποσταῆς, ὥς ἂν ἰνώσῃς τὸ μίλος εἰς ὁμόνοιαν.

^b Chrysostom. Hom. xxii. de Ira, p. 285, A. 5, (p. 253, edit. Francof.) Ἰδοὺ προλέγω, καὶ διαμαρτύρομαι, καὶ λαμπρῶ βοῶ τῇ φωνῇ, μηδὲς τῶν ἰχόντων ἰχθρὸν προσίτω τῇ ἱερᾷ τραπέζῃ, καὶ διχίσθω τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου μηδὲς προσίων ἰχθρὸν ἰχίστω. ἰχθρὸν ἔχῃς; μὴ προσέλθῃς· βούλι προσιλθεῖν; καταλλάγηθι, καὶ τότε προσελθὼν ἄψαι τοῦ ἱεροῦ. μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἰγὼ ταῦτα λέγω, ἀλλ' ὁ δὲ ἡμᾶς σταυρωθεὶς Δισπότης αὐτός· ἵνα σὶ καταλλάξῃ τῷ Πατρὶ, οὐδὲ σφαγῆναι παρητήσατο, οὐδὲ τὸ αἷμα ἰκχυῖν, καὶ σὺ ἵνα καταλλαγῇς τῷ συνδούλῳ, οὐδὲ ῥῆμα πρὸςθεοῦ βούλι, οὐδὲ πρότερος προσδραμῖν.

he assures them it was a duty, and an honourable duty, thus to imitate Christ in a charitable condescension : and whatever might be the effect of it here, it would have a double and a triple crown hereafter. Finally he tells them, with a solemn protestation,^c in the close of all, that if, after forty days' warning, he found any still persist irreconcilable to one another, he would no longer use admonitions, but proceed to severer methods, and order them to be kept back from the holy mysteries till they should amend their fault, and come to the holy table with a pure conscience, which was the only proper way to partake of the communion.

SECT. XIV. — *Of their Behaviour at the Communion, and afterwards.*

These were some of those necessary qualifications they required in men before they came to the holy communion : and, at the time of celebration, the very offices of the Church were so framed, as to elevate men's souls to the highest pitch of reverence, devotion, and thankfulness to God, for his mercies in the sacrifice of Christ, his only Son. To which purpose the reader may recollect what has been said of the great thanksgiving in the consecration of the eucharist ; and the *Sursum corda*, or ' call to lift up their hearts to the Lord ;' and of the seraphical hymns and angelical glorifications intended to set forth the praises of God in this excellent mystery. To which may be added that advice of Origen,^d " That men should approach it with the profoundest humility, imitating the good centurion, and saying, ' Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof.' That they

^c Chrysostom. Hom. xxii. de Ira, tom. i. p. 294, (p. 261, edit. Francof.) Τισ-
σερέωντα λοιπὸν ἡμεῖς παρῆλλον . . . πᾶσι τοῖς περὶ ἡμᾶς καὶ διαμαρτυροῦμαι,
ὅτι ἂν συγγινώσκουσιν ὑμῖν κατ' ἴδιον, καὶ λαβὼν ἀπόστιραν, λάβωμαι δι' πάντας,
καὶ εἶρω τινὰς μὴ διορθώσαντας τὸ ἰλάττωμα, ἀπαιτήσω δίκην, κτείνωσας ἔξω μὴνιν
τῶν μυστηρίων τῶν ἱερῶν, οὐχ ἵνα μίνωσιν ἔξω, ἀλλὰ διορθώσαντες ἑαυτοὺς οὕτως
εἰσέλθωσι, καὶ μετὰ καθαροῦ συνιδόντες ἀπολαύσουσι τῆς ἱερᾶς τραπέζης. (B. 10.)

^d Origen. Hom. v. de Diversis, tom. ii. p. 441, (part. ii. p. 285, e. edit.
Paris. 1604.) Quando sanctum cibum illudque incorruptum accipis epulum,
quando vitæ pane et poculo frueris, manducas et bibis corpus ac sanguinem
Domini, tunc Dominus sub tectum tuum ingreditur. Et tu ergo humilians temet-
ipsum imitare hunc centurionem, et dicito, ' Domine, non sum dignus, ut intres
sub tectum meum.

should then quit all thoughts of earthly things, and consider that they were then in the midst of cherubims and seraphims, angels and archangels, and all the powers above." For this mystery, in Chrysostom's phrase, turns earth into heaven :^e " Open the gates of heaven, and see ; or, rather, not heaven, but the heaven of heavens, and then you shall see what I say : for that which is the most honourable of all things there, that I will now shew you upon the earth ; not angels, or archangels, not the heavens, or the heaven of heavens, but the Lord of them all, whom you not only see, but touch, and eat, and carry home with you." Therefore upon this he grounds several excellent exhortations. " Let us become eagles,^f and fly up to him in heaven ; let us have nothing to do with the earth, but look upward to the Sun of Righteousness ; let us not receive him with polluted hands, but come to him with reverence, and all imaginable purity, saying, ' By this body I am no longer earth and ashes ; I am no longer a captive, but free : for this I hope to receive heaven, and all the good things therein, — immortal life, the condition of angels, the society of Christ.' Cleanse, therefore, and wash thy soul, prepare thy mind for the reception

^e Chrysostom. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. p. 538, (p. 261, edit. Francof.) ' Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ σοι τὴν γῆν οὐρανὸν ποιεῖ τοῦτο τὸ μυστήριον. ἀναπέτασον γούν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὰς πύλας, καὶ διέκνυλον μᾶλλον δι' οὐχὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τότε ὄψῃ τὸ εἰρημίνον τὸ γὰρ πάντων ἐκὶ τιμιώτερον, τοῦτό σοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διέξω κίμειον. ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις τὸ πάντων σιμωότερον, οὐ τοχοί, οὐκ ὄροφος χειρῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ βασιλικὸν σῶμα τὸ καθήμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου· οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σῶμα. ἀλλὰ τοῦτό σοι νῦν ἔξιστιν ἐπὶ γῆς ἰδεῖν οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλους, οὐδὲ ἀρχαγγέλους, οὐδὲ οὐρανούς καὶ οὐρανούς οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν τοῦτο σοι δίδυνμι Δισπότην' . . . καὶ οὐχ ὄρεξ' ἔμειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄσπῃ καὶ οὐχ ἄσπῃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰσθίους, καὶ λαβὼν οἰκαδὲ ἀναχωρεῖς.

^f Ibid. pp. 536, 538, (p. 260, edit. cit.) Καὶ αὐτοὺς γινόμενους ἐνταῦθα, οὕτως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἵστασθαι τὸν οὐρανόν' . . . καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν κοινὸν ἔχουσιν, μηδὲ κάτω εὐρεσθαι, καὶ ἔρπιν, ἀλλ' ἄνω στίσθαι διηνικῶς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἰσοεῖν, καὶ ἔξυδερκεῖς τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας ἔχουσιν. . . οὐκ ἔν σοι ἔλαιο βυπαραιεῖ αὐτοῦ κατατολμῆσαι χερσίν' . . . ἀλλὰ μετὰ φρίκης καὶ καθαρότητος ἀπάσης αὐτῇ προσέωμιον. . . Λίγιστον πρὸς σιαυτόν· διὰ τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα, οὐκίτι γῆ καὶ σπυρδὸς ἰγὰρ, οὐκίτι κίχμαλωςτος, ἀλλ' ἱλιούτερος· διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς οὐρανούς ἱλπίζω, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπολήψισθαι ἀγαθὰ, τὴν ἀθάνατον ζωὴν, τὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων λῆξιν, τὴν μετὰ Χριστοῦ ἰμιλίαν. — P. 261, fin. ' Ἀπόσπῃ τὸν τὴν ψυχὴν, παρασκευάζει τὴν διάνοιαν πρὸς τὴν τοῦτων τῶν μυστηρίων ὑπαδοχὴν' καὶ γὰρ εἰ παιδίον βασιλικὸν μετὰ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῆς ἀλουργίδος καὶ τοῦ διαδήματος ἐνιχυρίσθης φέρον, πάντα ἂν ἱβρίψας τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ. νυνὶ δὲ οὐ παιδίον ἀνθρώπου βασιλικόν,

of those mysteries. If the son of a king, in all his ornamental robes, his purple, and his diadem, were put into thy hands to carry, thou wouldst contemn all earthly things; but, now, thou receivest not the son of a mortal king, but the only-begotten Son of God. And art thou not afraid still to retain the love of worldly things? Why is not this ornament alone sufficient for thee, but thou must yet needs look to the earth, and be in love with riches? Knowest thou not that thy Lord has an aversion to all the pomp and magnificence of this life? Was he not, therefore, born of a poor mother, and at his birth laid in a manger? And was not his answer this, to the man who thought to make a gain of his service, ‘The Son of man hath not where to lay his head?’ Let us, therefore, imitate him; and, passing by the beauty of pillars and marbles, let us seek for mansions in heaven above; and, trampling upon all worldly pride, and the love of riches, let us take to ourselves lofty souls, and mind the things that are on high.” “When you come to the holy table and the sacred mysteries,” says he,^s in another place, “do it with fear and reverence, with a pure conscience, with fasting and prayer. Consider what a sacrifice you partake of, what a table you approach unto. Consider, that thou who art but dust and ashes, receivest the body and blood of Christ. God calls thee to his own table, and sets before thee his Son; where the angelical powers stand about

ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν μονογενῆ λαμβάνων τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖδα, οὐ φρίττεις, εἰςί μοι, καὶ πάντα τὸν τῶν βιωτικῶν ἐκβάλλεις ἱερῶτα, καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ παλλωπίζῃ μόνον ἐκίει, ἀλλ' ἔτι πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἑρᾷς, καὶ χρημάτων ἑρᾷς; καὶ πρὸς χρυσὸν ἱπτόησαι; καὶ τίνα ἂν σχοίης συγγνώμην, ποίαν ἀπολογίαν; οὐκ οἶσθα πῶς ἅπασαν τὴν βιωτικὴν πολυσίλωσαν ἀποστρέφεται σου ὁ διαπόσης; οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν φάτνῃ ἐτίθη τευχθεῖς, καὶ μητέρα ἔλαβεν ὑπότιλιν; οὐ διὰ τοῦτο τῷ πρὸς καπηλείαν ἐκίει βλίσσονται ἔλιγον, ὅτι δὲ τίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει, ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίει; τί δὲ οἱ μαθηταί; οὐ σὺν αὐτῶν διατῆρουν νόμον, εἰς τὰς τῶν πενήτων εἰκίας καταγόμενοι; . . . Τούτους τοίνυν καὶ ἡμῖς ζηλώσωμεν τὰ μὲν κάλλη τῶν κίωνων καὶ τῶν μαρμάρων παρατρέχοντες, ζητοῦντες δὲ τὰς αἰῶνα μόνας, καὶ πάντα τὸν τύφον τὸν ἐν ταῦτα πατήσωμεν μετὰ τῆς τῶν χρημάτων ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ ὑψηλὸν λάβωμεν φρόνημα.

^s Chrysostom. Hom. xxxi. de Nativit. Christi, tom. v. p. 479, C. 4, (Hom. xxxi. p. 429, edit. Francof.) Μίλλοντες προσίναμι τῇ φεισῇ καὶ θείᾳ ταύτῃ τραπίζῃ, καὶ ἱερᾷ μυσταγωγίᾳ, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ταῦτο ποιῶσι, μετὰ καθαυτοῦ συνιδότος, μετὰ ἡσυχίας καὶ προσευχῆς. . . Ἐννόησον, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, ποίας μίλλους ἀπαιτῶσαι θυσίας, ποίας προσέχεσθαι τραπίζῃ; ἐνθυμήθητι καὶ ὅτι γῆ ἂν καὶ σπῆδος, αἷμα καὶ σῶμα Χριστοῦ μυσταλαμβάνεις; καὶ βασιλῆως μὲν εἰς ἐνδοχίαν καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς,

with fear and trembling, and the cherubims cover their faces, and the seraphims cry, with reverence, 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Hosts.' Let us, therefore, come with the greatest reverence also, and give thanks, and fall down and confess our sins, and with tears bewail our offences, and offer up fervent prayers to God. And so purifying ourselves in quietness and decent order, let us come as to an heavenly King; and receiving the holy and immaculate sacrifice, let us kiss and embrace it with our mouths and eyes, and therewith warm our souls; that we come not together to judgment and condemnation, but to create in us sobriety of mind, and charity, and virtue; and reconcile ourselves to God, and obtain a lasting peace, and whatever other blessings arise from thence, that we may both sanctify ourselves and edify our neighbours."

And as they thus taught men with what veneration and serious deportment they ought to behave themselves at the Lord's table; so they endeavoured to make lasting impressions of virtue upon men's minds by this argument, shewing them what obligations of holiness and purity the reception of the body and blood of Christ laid upon every member of the body, and every faculty of the soul. It was an oblation of their bodies and souls to God; it was an oath, or bond and covenant, to do no evil, but to exercise themselves in all manner of virtue; as Pliny represents it,^h from the

μιτὰ φόβου ἀνακλίνεσθαι, καὶ τῶν προκείμενων μιστὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ ἡσυχίας μεταλαμβάνειν ἰδισμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ καλοῦντος ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τράπεζαν, καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ προσκείμενον υἱὸν, ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων περισταμένων μιστὰ φόβου καὶ τρέμου, καὶ τῶν Χερουβιμ κατακαλυπτόντων τὰ πρόσωπα, τῶν Σεραφίμ κραζόντων τρέμῃ, "Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Κύριος· σὺ κράζεις, ἐγὼ μοι, καὶ Θαρσὺν πρὸς τὴν πνευματικὴν ταύτην ἰστίαν; . . . Φεῖξωμιν τοίνυν προσκείμεντοι, εὐχαριστήσωμιν, προσπίσωμιν ἱερομολογούμενοι τὰ πταίσματα ἡμῶν, δακρύσωμιν τὰ οἰκτῖα πινθόντες κακὰ, ἱκετιῖς εὐχὰς ἀποδόμενι τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ οὕτω διαπαθέραντες ἑαυτοὺς ἡρέμα, καὶ μιστὰ τῆς προσκοιούσης ὑπαξίας, ὡς τῇ βασιλεῖ προσκείμεντοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὕτω προσέλωμεν καὶ διζήμενοι τὴν ἁμωμον καὶ ἁγίαν Θυσίαν καταφιλήσωμιν, τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς περιστρεφόμεθα, διαβερμάνωμιν ἑαυτῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα συνερχόμεθα, ἀλλ' εἰς σωφροσύνην ψυχῆς, εἰς ἀγάπην, εἰς ἀρετὴν, καὶ καταλλαγὴν τὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, εἰς ἐξήννη βιβλαίαν, καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν ὑπόθεσιν, ἵνα καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἀγιάσωμιν, καὶ τοὺς πλησίον οἰκοδομήσωμιν.

^h Plin. lib. x. ep. xcvi. Adfirmabant, hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti statò die ante lucem convenire; carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem; seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod

mouths of some Christians. Therefore Chrysostom elegantly represents it as an obligation laid upon every member of the body, the hands, the eyes, the lips, and tongue, the heart and soul especially, to abstain from all pollution and impurity of sin :ⁱ “Thou fastest before thou dost communicate, that thou mayest appear worthy : and dost thou destroy all after communicating, when thou oughtest to be more temperate? I do *not* enjoin thee to fast, but to abstain from luxury and all the evil effects of it, immoderate laughter, disorderly words, pernicious jesting, foolish and vain discourse, and whatever a Christian ought not to speak, who has been entertained at Christ’s table, and touched his flesh with his tongue. Whoever thou art, therefore, purify thy hands, thy lips, and thy tongue, which have been the gates at which Christ entered into thee. When thou sittest down to a common table, remember that spiritual table, and call to mind that supper of the Lord. Consider what words thy mouth hath spoken,^k words worthy of such a table ; what things thy mouth hath touched and tasted, what meat it has fed upon. Dost thou think it no harm, with that mouth, to speak evil of and revile thy brother? How canst thou call him brother? If he is not thy brother, how couldst thou say, ‘Our Father?’ For that implies more

obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent. (Gierig. 1802, ii. 514.)

ⁱ Chrysostom. Hom. xxvii. in 1 Cor. p. 567, (p. 297, seq. edit. Francof.) Σὺ πρὶν ἢ μὴν μεταλαβεῖν ἡστυαίους, ἵνα ὅπως δέποιαι ἄξιος φανῇς τῆς κοινωνίας. ὅταν δὲ μεταλάβῃς, δίδω σε ἱκανοῦναι τὴν σωφροσύνην, πάντα ἀπολλύεις. καίτοιγε οὐκ ἴσταν ἴσον πρὸ τούτου νῆφιν καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα· διὸ μὴν γὰρ ἐν ἱκανίῳ σωφρονεῖν, μάλιστα δὲ μετὰ τὸ δεῖξασθαι τὸν νυμφίον· πρὸ τούτου μὴν, ἵνα ἄξιος γίνῃ τοῦ λαβεῖν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, ἵνα μὴ ἀνάξιος φανῇς ὡς ἔλαβες. τί οὖν, ἡστυαίῳ διὸ μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν; οὐ λίγω τοῦτο, οὐδὲ παταναγκάζω· καλὸν μὴν γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο· πλὴν οὐ βιάζομαι τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ παραινῶ μὴ τρυφᾶν εἰς ἀπληστίας· . . . Οὐκ ὁδοῖς ὅσα ἀπὸ τρυφῆς ἱκανοῖσθαι κακὰ; γίλως ἁπαιροῖς, ῥήματα ἄτακτα, ὑπεραυτλία ὑλίου γίμουσα, φλυαρία ἀνόητος, τὰ ἄλλα δὲ μὴδὲ εἰσιῖν καλόν. καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖς τραπίζας ἀπολαύσας Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὴν ἡμίραν ἐκίνην, καθ’ ἣν ἀψασθαι διὰ γλώττης τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ κατηγιώθης. πῶς οὖν, ἵνα ταῦτα μὴ γίνηται, καθάγινε σου τὴν διέαν, τὴν γλῶττην, τὰ χεῖλη, ἀπὶρ ἰγίνετο πρόθυρα τῇ ἐκβάσει τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ τραπίζαν παραθεῖς αἰσθητὴν, πρὸς ἐκίνην τὴν τραπίζαν τὸν νοῦν ἀνάτεινον, πρὸς τὸ διῆκον τὸ Κυριακόν.

^k Ibid. Hom. xiv. in Ephes. p. 1127, (pp. 981, 983.) See Book xiii. chap. vi. sect. x.

persons than one. Consider with whom thou stoodest in the time of the holy mysteries : with cherubims, with seraphims. But the cherubims use no reviling. Their mouth is filled with one office, glorifying and praising God. How, then, canst thou say with them, 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' who usest thy mouth to reviling? Tell me, if there were a royal vessel, always filled with royal dainties, and set apart only for this use, and one of the servants should use it to put dung in ; would he dare, after that, to put it, thus filled with dung, among the other vessels appointed for royal use? No : certainly. Yet this is the very case of railing and reviling. You say at the holy table, 'Our Father,' and then immediately add, 'which art in heaven.' This word raises you up, and gives wings to your soul, and shews that you have a Father in heaven. Therefore do nothing, speak nothing, of earthly things. He hath placed you in the order of spirits above, and appointed you a station in that quire. Why, then, do you draw yourself downward? You stand by the royal throne, and do you revile your brother? How are you not afraid, lest the king should take it as an affront offered to himself? If a servant beats or reviles another in our presence, who are but his fellow-servants, though he does it justly, we rebuke him for it. And dare you stand before the royal throne, and revile your brother? See you not these holy vessels? Are they not always appropriated to one peculiar use? Dares any one put them to any other? But you are more holy than these vessels, yea, much more holy. Why, then, do you pollute and defile yourself? You stand in heaven, and do you still use railing? You converse with angels, and do you yet revile? You are admitted to the Lord's holy kiss ; and do you yet revile? God hath honoured and adorned your mouth so many ways, by angelical hymns, by food, not angelical, but super-angelical, by his own kisses, and by his own embraces ; and do you, after these, revile? Do not, I beseech you. Let that which is the cause of so many evils, be far from the soul of a Christian." With what force and eloquence does this holy writer here shew us the obligation, which the reception of the eucharist lays upon men to abstain from evil speaking : but it equally

lays a restraint upon all the other members of the body, and operations of the soul, as well as the tongue. Which Chrysostom excellently deduces after this manner, in another place :¹ “ Be grateful to thy benefactor by an excellent conversation ; consider the greatness of the sacrifice ; and let that engage thee to adorn every member of thy body. Consider what thou takest in thy hand, and never after endure to strike any man : do not disgrace that hand by the sin of fighting and quarrelling, which has been honoured with the reception of so great a gift. Consider what thou takest in thy hand, and keep thy hand free from all rapines and injustice. Think again, how thou not only receivest it in thy hand, but puttest it to thy mouth ; and keep thy tongue pure from all filthy and contumelious speech, from blasphemy and perjury, and all words of the like nature. For it is a most pernicious thing, that the tongue, which ministers in such tremendous mysteries, and is dyed with the purple of such precious blood, and made a golden sword, should be put to the vile practice of railing and reviling, and scurrilous and abusive language. Regard with veneration the honour wherewith God has honoured it ; and do not debase it to such mean offices of sin. Consider again, that after thy hand and thy tongue, thy heart receives that tremendous

¹ Chrysostom. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antioch. tom. i. p. 266, A. 4, (p. 236, edit. Francof.) “ Ἀμειψαί σου τὸν εὐεργέτην ἐρίστη πολυτίμη, καὶ ἰννήσας τῆς θυσίας τὸ μέγιστον, καλλώπισόν σου τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος· ἰννήσων τί δίχην τῇ χειρὶ, καὶ μηδὲ ποσὶ ἀνάσχη τυπτήσασί τινα, μηδὲ τὴν τοσούτῃ τιμηθῆσαν δώρῳ κατασχήσης τῇ τῆς πληγῆς ἁμαρτίᾳ· ἰννήσων τί δίχην τῇ χειρὶ, καὶ καθαρὰν αὐτὴν πλουσιότητος καὶ ἀρετῆς πάσης διαθήσων. Λόγισαι, ὅτι οὐ τῇ χειρὶ δίχην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ στόματι προσάγεις, καὶ καθαρὰν φύλαττε τὴν γλῶτταν αἰσχυρῶν καὶ ὑβριστικῶν ῥημάτων, βλασφημίας, ἱπιορκίας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων ἀπάντων. καὶ γὰρ ἐλπίδων τὴν διακονοῦμένην μυστηρίοις οὕτω φρικωδιστάσεις, καὶ αἵματι φοινιχθῆσαν τοιούτῃ καὶ χειρὶν γινομένην μάχαιραν ἐπὶ λουδορίας καὶ ὕβρις, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας μετάρη. αἰδίσθητι τὴν τιμὴν, ἣν ἐτίμησεν αὐτὴν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ μὴ καταγάγῃς εἰς τὴν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐντίλειαν· ἀλλ’ ἐνθυμηθεὶς πάλιν, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν ἡ καρδία δίχεται· σὺ φρικτὸν ἐκείνῳ μυστήριον, μὴ βλάβῃς μηδὲ ποσὶ κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον δόλον, ἀλλὰ ἀκρουεῖας πάσης καθαρὰν διαθήρῃ σου τὴν διάνοιαν οὕτω καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ ἀκοὴν ἀσφαλίσασθαι δυνήσῃ. πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄσπερον, μετὰ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐκείνην φωνὴν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν φερομένην, (τὴν ἐκ τῶν Χερουβιμ λίγων), πορρικτοῖς ἄσμασι, καὶ κατακικλασμένοις μέλισσι τὴν ἀκοὴν μολύνειν ; πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἐσχατίας κολάσεως ἔξιν, τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, οἷς ἔρεξ τὰ ἀπόρητα καὶ φρικτὰ μυστήρια, τοῦτοις πόντοις ὀρεῖν, καὶ μοιχίαν ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν κατὰ διάνοιαν ;

mystery. Then never devise any fraud or deceit against thy neighbour, but keep thy mind pure from all malicious designs. After the same manner, guard thy eyes and thy ears. For is it not most absurd, after that mystical hymn that was brought from heaven by the cherubims, to defile thy ears with the songs of harlots, and effeminate music? And what punishment can be too great for thee, if thou sufferest those eyes, which have seen the unspeakable and venerable mysteries, to wander gazing after harlots, and committest adultery in thy mind?" Tertullian, among many other arguments which he uses against a Christian's going to be a spectator at the Roman games, uses this as one, taken from the same topic:^m "What an absurdity is it for a man to go from the church of God into the church of the devil! 'Out of heaven,' as the saying is, 'into the mire!' First to lift up his hands in prayer to the Lord, and then to toss those very hands to weariness, in the praise of a stage-player! To make that mouth, which was used to say 'Amen' at the holy eucharist, give testimony to a gladiator! To cry out, 'World without end,' to others besides Christ his God!" By such familiar arguments, drawn from the nature of the sacrament, and the inconsistency of all vicious actions with the design, and circumstances, and whole tendency of it, did the ancients endeavour to possess men's minds with the sense of their duty, and their great obligation to persevere in holiness, and glorify God, both in body and spirit, all their days. Which, as it was but their reasonable service, so it was the only way to make this holy sacrament effectual to their salvation, and useful in their present state, by keeping up a perpetual and flaming love for Christ, which qualified them for a frequent reception, and almost daily repetition of it: which is the last thing to be considered in this whole inquiry.

^m Tertul. de Spectac. c. xxv, Paris. 1664, p. 83, C. Quale est de ecclesia Dei, in diaboli ecclesiam tendere? de cælo (quod aiunt) in cœnam! illas manus, quas ad Deum extuleris, postmodum laudando bistrionem fatigare! Ex ore quo Amen in sanctum protuleris, gladiatori testimonium reddere! αἱ αἰῶνας ἀπ' αἰῶνος alii omnino dicere nisi Deo et Christo!

CHAPTER IX.

OF FREQUENT COMMUNION, AND THE TIMES OF CELEBRATING
IT IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

SECT. I.—*All Persons, except Penitents under Censure, are oblig'd to receive the Communion every Lord's Day, by the Canons of the Church.*

It has been shewed before, in speaking against private and solitary masses, that though it be now the custom, in the Church of Rome, for the priest to receive the eucharist without any other communicants, either clergy or laity, how many soever be present at the action; yet there was no such custom ever heard of in the ancient Church. And though, in most other Churches, this corruption be reformed, yet there remains a great defect still uncorrected, which is the want or neglect of frequent communion. I shall make no further inquiry into the causes of this neglect, whether it proceed from a general decay of Christian piety, or from a want of strict discipline in the Church; but only observe, that it is a great declension from the zeal and fervour of the primitive ages. For then it is certain it was both the rule and practice for all in general, both clergy and laity, to receive the communion every Lord's day; except such as were unqualified for it either as catechumens or penitents, who, of course, for want of a due preparation, were oblig'd to abstain from it. Among the Apostolical Canons, there are two to this purpose. The first says,^a “If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the clergy does not communicate, when the oblation is offered; let him shew

^a Can. Apostol. c. [viii.] ix. Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱεραικοῦ, προσφορᾷς γινόμενης μὴ μεταλάβῃ, τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπάτω. Καὶ ἢ ἐν εὐλογίᾳ ἢ, συγγνώμης τυγχάνειτω· εἰ δὲ μὴ λόγῳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι, ὡς αἴτιος βλάβης γινόμενος τῇ λαῷ, καὶ ὑπόκειναι πειήσας κατὰ τοῦ προσενέγκαντος [ὡς μὴ ὀργῶς ἀντιγρόντος].—Can. [ix.] x. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσόντας πιστοὺς εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ παραλείποντας διὰ τῆς προσευχῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγίας μεταλήψι, ὡς ἀτάξιαν ἐμποιοῦντας [τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ], ἀφορίζεσθαι χρέει. (Florence, 1759.)

cause why he does not: that, if it be a reasonable cause, he may be excused; but if he shew no cause, let him be excommunicated; as giving scandal to the people, and raising suspicion against him that offers." And the next canon says, "If any of the faithful come to church to hear the Scriptures read, and stay not to join in the prayers, and receive the communion; let them be excommunicated, as the authors of disorder in the church." The Council of Antioch, which was held in the middle of the fourth century, repeats this decree:^b "Let all those be cast out of the church, who come to hear the Scriptures read in the church, but do not communicate with the people in prayer, or disorderly turn away from the participation of the eucharist; till, by confession and fruits of repentance and intercession, they have obtained pardon." These canons shew, that as often as they met together for Divine service, on the Lord's day, they were obliged to receive the eucharist under pain of excommunication. And all other canons which speak of the order of Divine service, plainly shew that the celebration of the eucharist was always one inseparable part of it. The Council of Laodicea, as has been often noted before, describes the whole in this order:^c "First, after the sermon, the prayers of the catechumens; and then, the prayers of the penitents; and after their departure, the prayers of the faithful; and then the kiss of peace; and, last of all, the offering of the holy oblation." And all such canons as forbid the penitents to be partakers of the eucharist,^d do plainly suppose all the rest of the people to be partakers of it. And if any man did not partake of it, it was an intimation, either that he was doing penance, or at least was conscious to himself of some great

^b Conc. Antioch. c. ii. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δι' εὐχῆς ἅμα τῇ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφόμενους τὴν μετέληψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατὰ τινὰ ἀταξίαν· τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὡς ἂν ἱερομολογησάμενοι καὶ διέξαντες καρποὺς μετανοίας, καὶ παρακαλίσαντες, τυχεῖν δυνήωσι συγγνώμης. (Vol. ii. p. 562.)

^c Conc. Laodic. c. xix. See before, Book xv. chap. i. sect. i. note (*), p. 2.

^d Conc. Nic. c. xi. (ii. 33.) Ὅσοι γνησίως μεταμύλονται, τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀκρομύνοις ποιήσουσιν οἱ πιστοί, καὶ ἰστὰ ἔτη ὑποπισσοῦνται δύο δι' ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῇ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν. — Can. xiii. Μετὰ τῶν κοινωνούντων τῆς εὐχῆς μόνης ἔστω. — Conc. Ancyr. cc. iv.—vi. Κοινωνήτωσαν δίχα προσφορᾶς.

crime, for which he ought to do penance. For no others were allowed to abstain from the constant participation of the eucharist. "All they that do not communicate," says St. Chrysostom,^e "are penitents: if thou art of the number of those who do penance, thou mayest not partake. For whoever does not partake, is one of that number:" which implies, that all were obliged constantly to communicate, who were not doing penance publicly or privately for their offences. And this was so much the practice of those days, that the Council of Eliberis orders,^f that they who would not communicate, should not be allowed to make their oblations: which was a sort of excommunication of them; for the oblations and the eucharist commonly went together. The first Council of Toledo^g orders those who come to church, but neglect to communicate, to be admonished: and if they amend not upon admonition, then to be reduced to the state of formal penance for their crime. It were no hard matter to shew the like prescriptions in many other Councils;^h but these are sufficient to shew what was the standing rule of the first ages as to men's obligations to be constant in receiving the communion once a-week, in their solemn assembly, on the Lord's day.

^e Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051, (p. 888, edit. Francof.) "*Ὅσοι μὴ μετέχουσιν, ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰσὶν. εἰ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ εἰ, μετασχὺν οὐκ ὀφείλου· ὁ γὰρ μὴ μετέχων, ἐν μετανοίᾳ ἐστί.*"

^f Conc. Illiber. c. xxviii. Placuit ab eo, qui non communicat, episcopos munera accipere non debere. (i. p. 973.)

^g Conc. Tolet. I. c. xiii. De his, qui intrant in ecclesiam, et deprehenduntur numquam communicare, admoneantur: quod si non communicant, ad penitentiam accedant.

^h Conc. Matiscon. II. c. iv. Residentibus nobis in sancto Concilio, cognovimus quosdam Christianos, relicto fratrum cœtu, a mandato Dei aliquibus locis deviasse, ita ut nullus eorum legitimo obsecundationis parere velit officio deitatis, dum sacris altaribus nullam admovent hostiam. Propterea decernimus, ut omnibus Dominicis diebus altaris oblatio ab omnibus viris et mulieribus offeratur tam panis quam vini: ut per has immolationes, et peccatorum suorum fascibus careant, et cum Abel, vel ceteris justis offerentibus, promereantur esse consortes. Omnes autem, qui definitiones nostras per inobedientiam evacuare contendunt, anathemate percellantur. (Vol. v. p. 981.)

SECT. II. — *This shewed to be the constant Practice for the three first Ages.*

And if we run over the whole history of the three first ages, we shall find this to have been the Church's constant practice. Ignatius exhorts the Ephesians to be diligent in assembling frequently to celebrate the eucharist, and glorify God :ⁱ “ For, when ye often meet together, ye demolish the power of Satan ; and the harmony of your faith destroys the destruction which he meditates against you.” This frequency of communion may reasonably be supposed to be then, according to the known practice, once a-week, on every Lord's day. For on this day (as Pliny, who was contemporary with Ignatius, informs us,^k from the testimony and confessions of some Christians, whom he, as proconsul of Bithynia, examined) they were used to meet before it was light, by reason of the persecutions, and then not only sing hymns to Christ their God, but also to bind themselves, by a sacrament, against the commission of all manner of wickedness. Justin Martyr says more expressly, in his Apology to the Emperors,^l that, on the day called Sunday, they were all used to meet together, both out of city and country, and hold a religious assembly in this manner. First, a reader read the writings of the prophets and apostles : then, the president of the assembly made a sermon ; after which, they all rose up to common prayers ; and when those were ended, bread and wine were brought to the president, who consecrated them with prayer and thanksgiving, to which all the people said, ‘ Amen.’ Then all the present members participated of the eucharist, and it was carried to the absent by the deacons. The like account is given by Clemens of Alexandria, when he says,^m “ That as soon as the bread was broken in the

ⁱ Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. n. xiii. Σπουδάξτε συνεκκλησιασθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν· ὅτι διὰ γὰρ συνεκλῆσαι ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτὰ γίνεσθαι, καθαιρούνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανᾶ, καὶ λύνται ὁ ὄλεθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἰμνησίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως.

^k Plin. lib. x. ep. xcvi. See note (h), p. 342.

^l Justin. Apol. ii. p. 98. Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ, κ. τ. λ.

^m Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 318. Τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σινὲς διανύμαντις, ὡς ἴθις, αὐτὸν δὲ ἱεραστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μίραν ἐπιτρέψουσιν. — Conc. Laodic. c. xlix. Ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐν τισταρακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ καὶ κυριακῇ

celebration of the eucharist, they permitted every one of the people to take his share of it." And we shall presently see more of this custom of communicating every Lord's day, in the writings of Tertullian, and Cyprian, and Eusebius, and many others, who speak of other days as well as the Lord's day, appropriated in some Churches to this service. But about these the custom varied: for, on other days, some Churches celebrated the eucharist, and others did not; but, on the Lord's day, it was universally celebrated in all churches, and never omitted by any assembly of Christians whatsoever: insomuch, that someⁿ have observed, out of Chrysostom,^o that Sunday was anciently, among other names, called *dies panis*, 'the day of bread;' because the breaking of bread was so general a custom, in the Church, on that day.

SECT. III. — *The Eucharist celebrated on other Days besides the Lord's Day, in many Churches.*

As to other days, we may observe, out of Tertullian,^p that, in his time, they not only received the eucharist on Sundays, in their morning-assemblies before day, but also at other times, on other days; particularly on the anniversary festivals of the martyrs; and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, which were but one continued festival; and all their stationary days, that is, Wednesdays and Fridays in every week throughout the year. These things are not commonly observed by writers on this subject, but they add considerably to the argument about frequent communion. Tertullian says expressly of these stationary days, that they were always observed with receiving the eucharist. For he tells some, who objected against it on these days,^q "That their station would be so much the more solemn for their

μενεν. — Innocent. Epist. i. ad Decent. c. v. De fermento, quod die Dominico per titulos mittimus, &c.

ⁿ See Bishop Taylor's *Constant Communion*, p. 462.

^o Chrysostom. Hom. v. de Resurr. in edit. Latin.

^p Tertul. de Coron. Milit. c. iii. Antelucanis cœtibus eucharistiam sumimus, &c.

^q Ibid. de Orat. c. xiv. Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris?

standing at the altar." And whereas they scrupled to communicate, because they were afraid that receiving the eucharist would be a breaking of their fast (for these were *semi-jejunia*, 'half-fasts,' which they observed till three in the afternoon): he takes away this scruple also,^r and tells them, that receiving the eucharist would be so far from breaking their fast, that it would the more recommend it to God; and, by doing this, they would perfectly perform both duties together. St. Basil^s agrees with Tertullian, in making the stationary days not only fast-days, but days of communion. For, reckoning four days in the week on which they received the communion, he counts Wednesdays and Fridays, with Saturdays and Sundays, to complete the number. And Socrates^t notes it as a peculiar custom in the Church of Alexandria, that though they had religious assemblies on these days, and all other Divine service performed on them, yet they had not the communion. Which exception implies, that to receive the communion on those days, was the general custom of other Churches.

Tertullian as plainly intimates, that they received the communion upon all the festivals of the martyrs;^u and the same is noted by Cyprian,^w and Chrysostom,^x and Sidonius

^r Tertul. de Orat. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium eucharistia resolvit, an magis Deo obligat?

^s Basil. Epist. cclxxxix. ad Cæsar. Patricium, tom. iii. p. 279. 'Ημῖς μὲν τοιοῦτα τίταρτοι καθ' ἰκαστὴν ἰδὲ μάδα κοινονοῦμεν, ἐν τῇ τετραδί, καὶ ἐν τῇ παρασκευῇ, καὶ τῇ σαββάτῳ, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἡμέραις, ἵνα ἡ μνήμη μάρτυρος τινός. (Vales. 235, B.)

^t Socrat. lib. v. c. xxii. 'Ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, τῇ δὲ τετραδί καὶ τῇ λιγομένη Παρασκευῇ, γραφαὶ τι ἀναγιγνώσκονται, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ταῦτα ἐκμνηνύουσι, πάντα τε τὰ συνάξιμα γίνεται, δίχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τιλιότης.

^u Tertul. de Coron. c. iii. Eucharistiæ sacramentum, et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus. (P. 102.)

^w Cyprian. Ep. xii. al. xxxvii. p. 28, (p. 188, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Quamquam Tertullus . . . significet mihi dies, quibus in carcere beati fratres nostri ad immortalitatem gloriosæ mortis exitu transeunt; et celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum, quæ cito vobiscum Domino protegente celebrabimus.—Id. Ep. xxvii. al. xxxiv. (p. 224, edit. cit.) Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passionem et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus.

^x Chrysostom. Hom. lix. de Martyr. tom. v. p. 779, (p. 697, edit. Francof.) 'Εννήσων, ἡλικίος γίλως, μετὰ τοιαύτην σύνοδον, μετὰ παννυχίδας, μετὰ γραφῶν

Apollinaris.⁷ The passages have been cited at large in another place,⁸ and therefore I need not here repeat them. Tertullian^a says further, that the fifty days of Pentecost, or all the days between Easter and Pentecost, were one continued festival; and, since all festivals were communion-days, we may conclude that the communion was celebrated every day during this interval.

Saturday also, or the Sabbath, in every week, was observed as a religious festival in many Churches; and therefore, on this day likewise, they generally received the communion. This is expressly said by Socrates,^b and Cassian,^c and St. Basil,^d and Timothy of Alexandria,^e and St. Austin,^f and the author of the Apostolical Constitutions,^g and the Council of Laodicea.^h I have alreadyⁱ produced the several testimonies of these writers at large upon another occasion; and, therefore, it is sufficient here to make a short reference to them. By all this it appears undeniably, that in many Churches they had the communion four times every week, on Wednesdays, Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays, besides incidental festivals, which were very frequent: for, as Chrysostom tells us,^j there was scarce a week passed in the year but they had one or two commemorations of martyrs.

SECT. IV.—*And in some Places every Day.*

But we are assured further, that in some places they

ἀγίων ἀκρόασις, μετὰ μυστηρίων θείων κοινωνίαν, καὶ μετὰ πνευματικὴν χορηγίαν, ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα ἐν καθολικῇ φαίνεσθαι διημερεύοντας.

⁷ Sidon. lib. v. ep. xvii. Conveneramus ad sancti Justi sepulchrum. . . . Processio fuerat antelucana, solemunitas anniversaria . . . Cultu peracto vigiliarum . . . quisque in diversa secessimus, non procul tamen, utpote ad tertiam præsto futuri, quum sacerdotibus res divina facienda. (P. 361.)

^a Book xiii. chap. ix. sect. v.

^b Tertul. de Coron. c. iii. A die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.— Id. de Idolat. c. xiv. Excerpe singulas solemnitates nationum, et in ordinem exsere, Pentecosten implere non poterunt. (P. 94, B.)

^c Socrat. lib. v. c. xxii. lib. vi. c. viii.

^c Cassian. Institut. lib. iii. c. ii.

^d Basil. Ep. cclxxxix. See before, note (*), p. 352.

^e Timoth. Alex. c. xiii. ap. Bever. Pand. tom. ii. p. 168.

^f Aug. Ep. cxviii. See below, note (k).

^g Constitut. lib. ii. c. lix.

^h Conc. Laodic. c. xlix.

ⁱ Book xiii. chap. ix. sect. iii.

^j Chrysostom. Hom. xl. in Juvent. tom. i. p. 546. See Book xiii. chap. ix. sect. v. note (x).

received the communion every day. St. Austin says,^k in some places only on the Saturday and the Lord's day, and in other places only on the Lord's day: for this was left to the liberality of every Church; but they that communicated the seldomest, did it, at least, every Lord's day. So, again,^l "The sacrament of his body, the Church and its unity, is, in some places, prepared and taken every day at the Lord's table: in other places, only on certain days, with an interval of time between them." In the greater Churches, probably, they had it every day; in the lesser, only once or twice a week. Carthage seems to have been one of those Churches which had it every day,^m from the time of Cyprian; for Cyprian, and Austinⁿ after him, speak of it as the custom of that Church to receive it daily, unless they were under some such grievous sin as separated them from the body of Christ, and kept them, as penitents, from communicating. Therefore Cyprian gives this as one sense of that petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day, our daily bread," as if it might be understood in the spiritual sense, as well as the natural, as a petition to be daily fed with the flesh of Christ in the eucharist, which was the bread of life." In another place^o he exhorts the martyrs to prepare themselves for the fight of persecution, considering that they, therefore,

^k Aug. Ep. cxviii. c. ii. (ii. 94.) *Alii quotidie communicant corpori ac sanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt: alibi nullus dies prætermittitur, quo non offeratur; alibi sabbato tantum et Dominico; alibi tantum Dominico: et si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet observationes.*

^l Ibid. Tractat. xxvi. in Joan. p. 94, (tom. ix. p. 230, edit. Basil. 1569.) *Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in Dominica mensa preparatur et sumitur. (iii. 362.)—Vide sis etiam lib. ii. de Serm. Domin. in Monte, c. vii. (tom. iv. opp. pp. 1147, 1148, edit. Basil.)*

^m Cyprian. de Orat. Dom. p. 147, (p. 104, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) *Hunc panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne, qui in Christo sumus, et eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti et non communicantes a cœlesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur.*

ⁿ Aug. de Dono Perseverantiæ, lib. ii. c. iv. *Quarta petitio est, Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie. Ubi beatus Cyprianus ostendit, quomodo et hic intelligatur perseverantia postulari. Ait quippe inter cetera, 'Hunc panem dari nobis,' &c. (x. 545, F.)*

^o Cyprian. Epist. xxxvi. al. xxxviii. ad Thibaritanos, p. 120, (Epist. lviii. p. 255, edit. Amstelod.) *Idcirco se quotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere, ut possint et ipsi propter Christum sanguinem fundere.*

drink the cup of Christ's blood every day, that they may be able to shed their blood for Christ. "Therefore," says he, a little after,^p "Let us arm our hand with that spiritual sword, that it being mindful of the eucharist (the Christian sacrifice), may valiantly refuse those abominable and deadly sacrifices of the heathen; let that hand, which has received the body of the Lord, embrace the Lord himself, being afterward to receive the reward of an eternal crown from the Lord in heaven." To which may be added what he says in another place,^q "That the priests who celebrated the daily sacrifices of God, did also prepare the martyrs to offer themselves as victims and oblations unto God." Where, by the daily sacrifice, he certainly means the eucharist, which is often called the 'daily sacrifice'^r by the ancients, for the same reason as the Lord's Prayer is called the 'daily prayer,' because they were both daily celebrated at the altar. St. Jerom assures us,^s it was the custom at Rome for the faithful to receive the body of Christ every day; which he neither absolutely commends, nor disallows, but leaves every man to abound in his own sense; only requiring men to receive it with due preparation. In another place he says,^t "It was

^p Cyprian. Epist. xxxvi. al. xxxviii. ad Thibaritanos, p. 125, (p. 258.) *Armeus et dexteram gladio spiritali, ut sacrificia funesta (Gentilium) fortiter respuat, et eucharistiæ memor, quæ Domini corpus accepit, ipsum complectatur, postea a Domino sumtura præmium cælestium coronarum.*

^q Ibid. Epist. liv. al. lvii. ad Cornel. p. 118, (p. 253.) *Sacerdotes, qui sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus, hostias Deo et victimas præparemus.*

^r Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051, (p. 888, edit. Francof.) *Εἰς τὴν Συναγωγὴν καθήμενός, κ. τ. λ.*

^s Hieron. Epist. l. ad Pammach. contra Jovin. c. vi. *Scio Romæ hanc esse consuetudinem, ut fideles semper Christi corpus accipiant: quod nec reprehendo nec probō: 'unusquisque enim in suo sensu abundat.'* (Venet. i. 227, D.)

^t Ibid. Epist. xxviii. ad Lucinium Boeticum. De eucharistia, quod quæris, an accipienda quotidie, quod Romana ecclesia et Hispaniæ observare perhibentur; scripsit quidem et Hippolytus, vir disertissimus, et carptim diversi scriptores e variis auctoribus edidere. Sed ego illud te breviter admonendum puto, traditiones ecclesiasticas (præsertim quæ fidei non officiant) ita observandas, ut a majoribus traditæ sunt: nec aliorum consuetudinem aliorum contrario more subverti. Atque utinam omni tempore jejulare possimus: quod in Actibus Apostolorum diebus Pentecostes et die Dominico, apostolum Paulum, et cum eo credentes fecisse legimus. Nec tamen Manichææ hæreseos accusandi sunt, quum carnalis cibus præferri non debuerit spirituali. Eucharistiam quoque absque condemnatione nostri, et pungente conscientia, semper accipere, et Psalmistam audire dicentem, 'Gustate et videte, quoniam suavis est Dominus.' (i. 434, D.)

not only the custom at Rome, but of the Spanish Church, to communicate every day." And to one who proposed the question to him as a case of conscience, "Whether he ought to communicate every day?" he gives this answer, "That the customs and traditions of every Church, which did not prejudice the faith, were to be observed in such manner as they were handed down by their forefathers; and the custom of one Church was not to prescribe to, or overthrow, the contrary custom of another." And he wishes that all men might receive the eucharist every day, provided they might do it without condemnation, and pricks of conscience, for unworthy receiving. Which is the same resolution as St. Austin gave in the question: for, having stated the arguments on both sides, for and against daily receiving; the one pleading, that men ought to abstain for a few days, that they might prepare to receive more worthily when they came to it; and the other arguing, that unless their sins were such as deserved excommunication, and the cure of a more solemn repentance, they ought not to separate themselves from the daily medicine of Christ's body; he divides the matter between them, determining that each party might act according as their own judgment and faith in this case piously directed them. For neither of them^u intended to

^u Aug. Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. c. iii. Dixerit aliquis non quotidie accipendam eucharistiam. Quæsieris quare? Quoniam, inquit, eligendi sunt dies, quibus purius homo continentiusque vivit, quo ad tantum sacramentum dignus accedat. 'Qui enim manducaverit indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit.' Alius contra, Immo, inquit, si tanta est plaga peccati atque impetus morbi, ut medicamenta talia differenda sint, auctoritate antistitis debet quisque ab altario removeri ad agendam pœnitentiam, et eadem auctoritate reconciliari. Hoc est enim indigne accipere, si eo tempore accipiat, quo debet agere pœnitentiam; non ut arbitrio suo, quum libet, vel auferat se communioni, vel reddat. Ceterum si peccata tanta non sunt, ut excommunicandus quisquam homo iudicetur, non se debet a quotidiana medicina Dominici corporis separare. Rectius inter eos fortasse quispiam dirimit litem, qui monet, ut præcipue in Christi pace permaneant: faciat autem unusquisque, quod secundum fidem suam pie credit esse faciendum. Neuter enim eorum exhonorat corpus et sanguinem Domini, sed saluberrimum sacramentum certatim honorare contendunt. Neque enim litigaverunt inter se, aut quisquam eorum se alteri præposuit, Zachæus et ille centurio, quum alter eorum gaudens in domum suam suscepit Dominum, alter dixerit, 'Non sum dignus, ut intres sub tectum meum:' ambo Salvatorem honorificantes diverso et quasi contrario modo; ambo peccatis miseri, ambo misericordiam consequuti. Valet etiam ad hanc similitudinem, quod in primo populo unicuique manna secundum propriam voluntatem in ore sapiebat; sic in ore [corde] uniuscujusque Christiani

dishonour the body and blood of the Lord, whilst they strove earnestly who should do the greatest honour to the holy sacrament of their salvation. In like manner, as Zacchæus and the centurion were at no variance between themselves; neither did the one prefer himself before the other, when the one received the Lord into his house rejoicing, and the other said, "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof;" for they both really honoured their Saviour, though in a different, and, as it were, in a contrary way, being both miserable in their sins, and both alike obtaining mercy; so it is with pious Christians in this case: the one out of honour dares not receive the sacrament every day; and the other, out of honour, dares not let any day pass without receiving it. This was a holy strife indeed; and we see the dispute was not, whether they should receive it once or twice a-year, but whether they should receive it once or twice a-week, or rather every day. We have heard Gennadius say before,^x that he neither praises nor dispraises receiving the eucharist every day, but he persuades and exhorts all to receive it every Lord's day, if their minds be pure from affections to sin. St. Ambrose was more peremptory in his advice to receive it every day. "If it be our daily bread,"^y says he, "why dost thou receive it once a-year only, as the Greeks are used to do in the East? Receive that daily, which is for thy daily advantage: and so live, that thou mayest deserve daily to receive it. He that does not deserve to receive it every day, does not deserve to receive it after a year." Again,^z "I ought always to receive that which is shed for the remission of sins, that my sins may always be forgiven me: I, that am always sinning,

sacramentum illud, quando sumatur, æstimandum, or, quo subjugatus est mundus. Nam et ille honorando non audet quotidie sumere, et ille honorando non audet ullo die prætermittere. (vol. ii. p. 94.)

^x Gennad. de Dogmat. Eccles. c. liii. See chap. viii. sect. iii. sub litt. (c).

^y Ambros. de Sacram. lib. v. c. iv. (Paris. vol. iv. p. 133.) Si quotidianus est panis, cur post annum illum sumis, quemadmodum Græci in Oriente facere consuerunt? Accipe quotidie, quod quotidie tibi prosit. Sic vive, ut quotidie merearis accipere. Qui non meretur quotidie accipere, non meretur post annum accipere.

^z Ibid. lib. iv. c. vi. p. 132. Si, quotiescumque effunditur sanguis, in remissionem peccatorum funditur, debeo illum semper accipere, ut semper mihi peccata dimittantur. Qui semper pecco, semper debeo habere medicinam.

ought always to have my medicine at hand; as he that has a wound, seeks without delay for a cure." St. Ambrose here is very plain, that the communion was administered daily in the Western Church; but he seems to reflect upon the Greek Church, as if they had left off that custom. But he is to be interpreted by St. Austin,^a who speaks the same thing; but does not charge the whole Greek Church, nor any part of it, with this innovation, but only some particular men in some parts, who did not think themselves under any obligation to receive it daily. And, indeed, it appears from St. Chrysostom, and others, that, about this time, many began scandalously to neglect frequent communion, and contented themselves to receive once or twice a-year, upon some solemn festival. But the Church was far from encouraging this contempt: for she kept still to the custom of daily communion in many places, and in all places, to the celebration of it on Saturday and the Lord's day, and in many places on Wednesdays and Fridays also; and they that were piously disposed, were constant communicants at these times; and they that were negligent and profane, were earnestly invited to be more frequent in communicating, and there are many severe invectives against their remissness. Eusebius^b says expressly, that they celebrated the memorial of Christ's body and blood, *ισημέραι*, 'every day.' And it appears from the Council of Laodicea,^c that they had it twice in the week, on Saturdays and Sundays, in Lent, and at all other times of the year more frequently. St. Basil^d speaks of four days in the week on which it was usual to receive the communion, besides incidental festivals of martyrs; and he commends it as good and useful to communicate and participate of the holy body and blood of Christ^e

^a Aug. de Serm. Dom. in Monte, lib. ii. c. vii. (tom. iv. p. 1147, edit. Basil.) Plurimi in Orientalibus partibus non quotidie cœnæ Dominicæ communicant, cum iste panis quotidianus dictus sit. (Vol. ii. part. ii. p. 150, F.)

^b Euseb. Demonstrat. Evangel. lib. i. c. x. p. 37. Τὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ἰσημέραι πιστιλοῦντες, κ. τ. λ.

^c Conc. Laodic. c. xlix. "Ὅτι οὐ διὰ τῇ τισσαρακκοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν σαββάτῳ καὶ κυριακῇ μόνον.

^d Basil. Epist. cclxxxix. ad Cæsaream. See sect. iii. note (*), p. 352.

^e Ibid. Τὸ κοινωνεῖν καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καλὸν καὶ ἰσχυρὸν.

every day, καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν. Palladius tells us,^f how Marcarius advised a woman that had been under the power of enchantment, never to omit receiving the communion; telling her, that that judgment had befallen her, because that, for five weeks, she had neglected to partake of the holy mysteries. But none is more express in this matter, nor more vehement against the neglect of frequent communion, than St. Chrysostom. He tells us sometimes, that they had communions every day for those that were more devoutly disposed; sometimes on the three more solemn days in the week, Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays, on which days the whole Church was expected: though for all this many came not above once a-year. "In vain," says he,^g "is 'the daily sacrifice,' καθημερινή Θυσία, in vain do we stand at the altar: there is none to participate." He speaks this against those who came but once a-year out of mere custom at some solemn festival; whilst, in the meantime, the sacrifice was daily offered, though they refused to partake of it. In another place, discoursing of the difference between the Jewish and Christian Passover, he says,^h "The Jewish Passover comes but once a-year, but the Christian Passover is celebrated in every *synaxis*, or 'assembly.'" And a little after, "Lent comes but once a-year; but the Passover is celebrated three times a-week, and sometimes four, or as often as we please." Again,ⁱ "This is what destroys all

^f Pallad. Hist. Lausiac. c. xix. Bibl. Patr. Gr.-Lat. tom. ii. p. 923. 'Ταύτην δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἄνθρωπος, ἰσὺν αὐτῇ, Μηδίσποτε ἀπολυθῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, μηδίσποτε ἀποσχῆς τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ταῦτα γάρ σε συνίστη, διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ πέντε ἡβδομάδας μὴ προσελθύνειν σι τοῖς ἑχράντοις μυστηρίοις τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. — See also Caesian. Collat. vii. c. xxx. where he speaks of daily communion: 'Communione eis sacrosanctam a senioribus nostris numquam meminimus interdictam, quin immo si possibile esset, etiam quotidie eis impartiri eam debere censebant.' (Lips. 1733, p. 330.)

^g Chrysostom. Hom. iii. in Ephes. p. 1051, (p. 888, edit. Francof.) Εἰπὼν Θυσία καθημερινή, ἰσὺῃ παρουσῆκαμιν τῇ Θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐδὲς ἰ μιτήχων.

^h Ibid. Hom. lii. in eos, qui pascha jejulant, tom. v. p. 705, C. (p. 632, edit. cit.) Οὗς ἡδὴς ἔγνωσαν ἂν ἱερίῳ, εἰ ποτὶ ἔστι πάσχα· εἰ ποτὶ ἔστι τισσαρακοστή, καὶ εἰ μὴν τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν, εἰ δὲ τὸ ἡμέτερον, καὶ τίνας ἵκεν ἡμεῖς μὴν ἅπασι τοῦ ἱεροῦ πάντες ἰγίσκε, ταῦτο δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην ταλιῶται σύναξις; — P. 709. Οὐ ταῦτόν πάσχα καὶ τισσαρακοστή, ἀλλ' ἴτερον πάσχα, καὶ ἴτερον τισσαρακοστή· τισσαρακοστή μὴν γὰρ ἅπασι τοῦ ἱεροῦ γίνεται, πάσχα δὲ εἴτερον τῆς ἡβδομάδος· ἔστι δ' ἔτι καὶ τίταρον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἰσάκις ἂν βουλώμεθα.

ⁱ Ibid. Hom. v. in 1 Tim. p. 1548, (p. 437, edit. cit.) Ταῦτο τὸ διπλὸν, οὐ

religion, that men measure their worthiness, not by the purity of their souls, but by the length of time; and take this for piety and reverence, that they come not frequently to the Lord's table; not considering that if they come unworthily, though it be but once a-year, they are worthy of punishment. It is not boldness to come frequently, but to come unworthily, though a man do it but once in all his life; but we are so stupid and insensible as to think, that when we have wallowed in sin all the year, without any care to repent, it is sufficient that we have not daily presumed, in a contumelious manner, to touch the body of Christ: not considering that the Jews, who crucified Christ, did it but once. But, was their sin ever the less for that? And Judas betrayed him but once; but, did that excuse him? Why, therefore, do we measure this matter by time only? Let the seasonable time of our coming be a pure conscience. The communion is the same now as it is at Easter: there is the same grace of the Spirit—it is the Passover every day. The same sacrifice is offered on Fridays, and Saturdays, and Sundays, and the festivals of the martyrs." It is plain, by all this, that the communion was celebrated ordinarily three or four times a-week, if not every day; though some were so vain as to think they were the more respectful to it, in not coming above once a-year, out of a pretended reverence for it; who yet, when they did come, came only to eat it to their condemnation, for want of a mind duly prepared to receive it. Whom he thus reflects upon in another place. "Many partake of this sacrament only once a-year, others

οὐ καθαρῶς διανοίας, ἀλλὰ διαστήματι χρόνου τὴν ἄξιαν διορίζεις τῆς προσόδου· καὶ τοῦτο ὑλάζουσιν εἶναι νομίζουσιν, τὸ μὴ πολλάκις προσελθῆναι, οὐκ εἰδότες, ὅτι τὸ ἀναξίως προσελθῆναι, καὶ ἅπαζ γίνεσθαι, ἐκκληθῶσι· τὸ δὲ ἄξιως, καὶ πολλάκις, ἴσονται. Οὐκ ἔστι τόλμα τὸ πολλάκις προσεῖναι· ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀναξίως, καὶ ἅπαζ τις τοῦ παντός χρόνου προσέλθῃ· ἡμῖς δὲ οὕτως ἀνοήτως [ἀναξίως] διακρίμεθα καὶ ἀθλίως, ὅτι μυρία διαπαντός ἐργαζόμενοι τοῦ ἵναυτοῦ κακῶς, τοῦ μὴ ἀπαυδῆσαι καὶ οὐδμίαν ποιούμεθα φροντίδα, νομίζομεν δὲ ἀρετὴν, τὸ μὴ συνεχῶς κατατολμῆναι καὶ ἱστανθῆναι ὀδρεστικῶς τῷ σώματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὐκ ἰννοοῦντες ὅτι καὶ οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν σταυρώσαντες ἅπαζ ἱσταύρωσαν· ἄρ' οὖν ἱσχυρὴ ἅπαζ, ἔλαττον τὸ ἁμάρτημα; καὶ ὁ Ἰουδας δι' ἅπαζ προέδωκε· τί οὖν; τοῦτο αὐτὸν ἐξέλιπε; Διὰ τί γὰρ χρόνον τὸ πρῶγμα μιστερχόμεθα; χρόνος προσόδου ἴστω ἡμῖν, τὸ καθαρὸν συνιδέειν· οὐδὲν πλὴν ἔχου τὸ ἐν τῷ πάσχῃ μυστήριον τοῦ νῦν τιλουμένου· ἢ ἔστι καὶ τὸ αὐτό· ἡ αὐτὴ τοῦ πνύματος χάρις· αὐτὸ πάσχα ἴστί· ἔστι οἱ μύσται τὸ εἰρημίνον· καὶ ἐν παρασκευῇ, καὶ ἐν σαββάτῃ, καὶ ἐν κυριακῇ, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μαρτύρων ἡ αὐτὴ θυσία ἱπταίλῃται.

twice, and others frequently: which of these are the most acceptable? They only who do it with a pure conscience, with a pure heart, with a life unblamable. With this qualification come always;^j without it come not so much as once: for they that do so, take only judgment, condemnation, and punishment, to themselves.” This he repeats over and over again in his Homilies: ^k “He that is conscious to himself of no crime, ought to come to the Lord’s table; but, if men are laden with sin, and do not repent, it is not safe for them to come even once upon a festival. The Jews have their annual memorials of God’s benefits on their festivals; but thou, who art a Christian, hast a daily memorial,^l as I may say, in these holy mysteries. The best preserver of kindnesses is the remembrance of them, and perpetual thanksgiving for them; therefore those venerable and salutary mysteries, which we celebrate every day^m in our assemblies, are called the eucharist, or thanksgiving, because they are the memorial of God’s kindness to us.” It were easy to collect abundance more such passages out of this ancient writer: but I will only add one place more, where he thus sharply taxes the people’s negligence of fre-

^j Chrysostom. Hom. xvii. in Hebr. p. 1872. (p. 845, edit. Francof.) Πολλοὶ τῆς θυσίας ταύτης ἄπαξ μεταλαμβάνουσιν τοῦ παντός ἐνικυτοῦ, ἄλλοι δὲ δις, ἄλλοι δὲ πολλάκις. . . . Τί οὖν; τίνας ἀποδιξόμεθα; τοὺς ἄπαξ; τοὺς πολλάκις; τοὺς ὀλιγάκις; [οὗτοι τοὺς ἄπαξ, οὗτοι τοὺς πολλάκις, οὗτοι τοὺς ὀλιγάκις,] ἀλλὰ τοὺς μετὰ καθαροῦ συνιδότες, τοὺς μετὰ καθαῶς καρδίας, τοὺς μετὰ βίου ἀλήπτου· οἱ τοιοῦτοι καὶ προσήκουσαν· οἱ δὲ μὴ τοιοῦτοι, μηδὲ ἄπαξ. τί δὴ ποτε; ὅτι κῆρυμα ἑαυτοῖς λαμβάνουσιν, καὶ κατὰ κριμα, καὶ κίλκασιν, καὶ τιμωρίαν.

^k Ibid. Hom. xxxi. de Philogon. tom. i. p. 403, A. (p. 357, edit. cit.) Καί τοις κοινωσίαις οὐχ ἱερὰ καὶ πανήγυρις· ἀλλὰ συνιδὸς καθαρὸν καὶ βίαις ἡγκλημάτων ἀπηλλαγμένους· καὶ καθάπερ τὸν οὐδὲν ἑαυτῷ συνιδότα φαῦλον καὶ ἰκαστὸν διὰ προσήκειν τὴν ἡμέραν οὕτω τὸν ἐν ἀμαρτήμασι προκαταληγμένον, καὶ μὴ μετανοοῦντα, οὐδὲ ἐν ἱερῇ προσήκειν ἀσφαλές.

^l Ibid. Hom. li. in Matth. p. 455, A. (p. 554, edit. cit.) Τοῖς μὲν Ἰουδαίοις κατ’ ἑκαστὸν ὑπόμνημα τῶν οἰκίων ἐνέργιστων τὰς ἱερὰς ἰνδύνας ὁ Θεός· σοὶ δὲ καὶ ἰκαστὸν, ὡς ἰσπίς, τὴν ἡμέραν διὰ τούτων μυστηρίων.

^m Ibid. Hom. xxvi. in Matth. p. 259, B. (p. 314, edit. cit.) Φυλακὴ ἐνέργιστος ἀρίστη ἢ τῆς ἐνέργιστος μήμη, καὶ διηκτικὴ εὐχαριστία· διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ φρικτὰ μυστήρια, καὶ πολλὰς γίμοντα σωτηρίας, τὰ καὶ ἰκαστὴν τιλούμενα [λίγω] σύναξιν εὐχαριστία καλεῖται, ὅτι πολλῶν ἰσπιν ἐνέργισμάτων ἀνάμνησις, καὶ τὸ πικρὰ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας ἐνδείκνυται, καὶ [ἔτι] διὰ πάντων παρασκευάζει εὐχαριστίαν.

quent communion: "I often observe," says he,^a "a great multitude flock together to hear the sermon; but, when the time of the holy mysteries comes, I can see few or none of them: which makes me sigh from the bottom of my heart, that when I, your fellow-servant, am discoursing to you, you are ready to tread upon one another for earnestness to hear, and continue very attentive to the end; but when Christ, our common Lord and Master, is ready to appear in the holy mysteries, the church is, in a manner, empty and deserted. What pardon or excuse can be allowed for this? By this neglect you lose all the praise that is due to your diligence in hearing. If you had laid up in your hearts what I preach to you, it would retain you in the church, and prompt you to receive the holy mysteries with piety and veneration: but now, as if you were hearing one play upon an instrument, the preacher has no sooner done, but ye are all gone out of the church." This, I confess, proves that in Chrysostom's days, there was a great abatement of the primitive zeal, and a great declension from the original practice; but still it is evident, that frequent and daily communions were, in some measure, kept up by the clergy and devouter sort of laity, who constantly frequented them, though many careless Christians had no other regard to them, but only to come formally once or twice a-year, and that with superstition enough instead of religion, at some of the solemn festivals.

^a Chrysostom. Hom. iii. de Incomprehensibili Dei Natura, tom. i. p. 362, C. 8, (p. 321, edit. Francof.) Τὸ πλῆθος τοῦτο τὸ ἄφρατον, τὸ συγκροτημένον νῦν, καὶ μὴτὰ τοσαύτης ἀκρίβειας προσίχον τοῖς λυγόμενοις, κατὰ τὴν φρικωδίστατην ἔραον ἐκείνην, πολλάκις ἐπιζητήσας ἰδεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη, καὶ σφόδρα ἰστίναξεν, ὅτι τοῦ μὲν συνδούλου διαλεγόμενου πολλῇ σπουδῇ, ἐπιτιταγμένη ἡ προθυμία τῶν συνελθόντων ἀλλήλους, καὶ μέχρι τίλους παραμεινόντων, τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ φαίνεσθαι μίλλοντος ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐκίναον μυστηρίον, κητὴ καὶ ἔρημος ἡ ἐκκλησία γίνεται. καὶ τοῦ ταῦτα συγγνώμης ἄξια, ἀπὸ τῆς βρυθυμίας ταύτης, καὶ τοὺς ἱεραῖους τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν σπουδῇ πάντας ἀπόλλυσι. . . . ἵ γὰρ ἱναπίκνυτο τὰ λυγόμενα ταῖς ψυχαῖς, πάντως ἂν ὑμᾶς ἴδον κατίσχειν, καὶ πρὸς τὰ φρικωδίστατα μετὰ πλείονος ὑσιδίας περιέπεμψιν· νῦν δὲ ἄσπερ καθαρθοῦ τινος ἀκούσαντες, οὕτως ἔρημοι πάσης ὀφιλίας παυσταμένου τοῦ λύγοντος ἀναχωρεῖτε.

SECT. V. — *When first it came to be settled to three Times in the Year.*

When matters were come to this degeneracy, some councils, instead of reviving the ancient discipline, and quickening men by just censures to frequent communion, contented themselves to oblige the laity to receive three times a-year, at the three great festivals, Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, under the penalty of not being reputed Catholic Christians, if they neglected to communicate at those three noted seasons. Thus it was first determined in the Council of Agde,^o about the year 506. And so things continued to the time of Charles the Great, when the third Council of Tours^p made a decree to the like purpose (an. 813), “That all laymen, who were not under the impediment of greater sins, should receive three times a-year at least, if not more frequently.” And yet the clergy continued to communicate frequently with some of the devouter laity every Lord’s day, as appears from the writers of that age, particularly Rabanus Maurus,^q and Bertram,^r who says the sacrament was administered not only at the Paschal solemnity every year, but on every day throughout the year, when as yet the corruption of private and solitary mass did not prevail, which came not in till some ages after. And it is remarkable, that, even in this age, the Council of Aix la Chapelle^s made some

^o Conc. Agath. c. xviii. Sæculares, qui in natali Domini, Pascha, et Pentecoste, non communicaverint, Catholici non credantur, nec inter Catholicos habeantur.

^p Conc. Turon. III. c. l. Ut si non frequentius, vel ter laici homines in anno communicent, nisi forte quis majoribus quibuslibet criminibus impediatur. (vii. 1269.)

^q Ralan. de Proprietate Sermonis, lib. i. c. x. (Not. Hunc librum inter opera ejus, Colon. Agripp. an. 1626, tom. vi. edita, non reperio. Grischov.) — Id. de Institut. Clericor. lib. i. c. xxxi. (Not. Nihil heic dicit de eucharistia, singulis diebus Dominicis a clericis et devotioribus laicis recepta, sed ait tantum, ‘Dicunt aliqui nisi aliquo interdicente peccato, eucharistiam quotidie accipient.’ Grischov.)

^r Bertram. de Corp. et Sanguine Domini, c. xxxvi. Sacramenta celebrantur non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates singulis annis, verum etiam singulis in anno diebus. (Oxon. 1838, p. 19.)

^s Conc. Aquisgran. c. lxx. ex Conc. Antioch. c. ii. (tom. vii. Conc. pp. 1359, 1360.) Omnes, qui ingrediuntur ecclesiam Dei, et Scripturas Sacras audiunt, nec

attempt to restore the ancient practice to its primitive lustre, by reviving the decree of the Council of Antioch, which orders all such as come to church to hear the Scriptures, but refuse to receive the holy communion, to be cast out of the church, till they should amend their fault by confession and repentance.

SECT. VI.—*And afterward to once a-Year by the Council of Lateran.*

But the disease was grown too epidemical and inveterate to be easily corrected; and, therefore, in a degenerate age the corruption went on and increased, and the Council of Lateran, under Innocent III., added strength and confirmation to it, reducing the obligation to communicate still within narrower bounds. For whereas before, all men were obliged to communicate at least three times a-year, this Council made it necessary to do it no more than once at Easter, when every man and woman that was come to years of discretion, was bound to make auricular confession of all his sins to his own priest, and receive the communion;† unless the priest advised that, for some reasonable cause, he should abstain from it. This rule was afterward taken into the body of their canon law.^u And here we may date the utter ruin of the ancient and apostolical practice of frequent and general communions. For, from this time, people began to think themselves discharged of the duty of frequent communicating, and contented themselves with receiving once a-year, at Easter, leaving their priests to communicate alone; which quickly was attended with another corruption of private and solitary masses, which usurped the room of

communicant in oratione cum populo, sed pro quadam intemperantia se a perceptione sanctæ communionis avertunt, hi de ecclesia removeantur, quamdiu per confessionem penitentiae fructus ostendant, et precibus indulgentiam consequantur.

† Conc. Lateran. IV. c. xxi. (tom. xi. Conc. p. 171, seq.) Πᾶς ἑκατέρου γίνους πιστὸς μιτὰ τὸ εἰς χρόνον διακρίσιως προσελθὲν, πάντα τὰ ἴδια ἁμαρτήματα ἔξομολογήσας πιστῶς, καὶ ἅπασι τοῦ ἱεραυτοῦ, τῷ ἰδίῳ ἱερεῖ, καὶ τὴν ἱπτιθίσαν αὐτῷ ἐντολὴν σπουδασάτω, ὅση δύναμις, ἐκπληροῦν μεταλαμβάνων εἰς ἕλαττον αἰδισίμως εἰς τὸ πάσχα τὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας μυστήριον· εἰ μὴ ἴσως τῇ βουλῇ τοῦ ἰδίου ἱερέως διὰ τινὰ εὐλογον αἰτίαν, εἰς καιρὸν, τῆς μεταλήψεως ἀπέχουτο.

^u Decretal. Gregor. lib. v. tit. xxxviii. de Pœnit. et Remiss. c. xii.

the ancient general communions of the whole Church one with another, and made the ancient prayers a perfect heap and mass of absurdities, whilst they prayed and gave thanks to God for the whole congregation as communicants, when there was not so much as one communicant, properly speaking, among them, but all mere spectators of the priest, pretending to act in the name of the whole Church; and communicate in pageantry, without any real communion. This was the general state of the Romish service at the time of the Reformation, except in some few collegiate Churches, where (if Bona^x say true) the clergy continued to communicate with the officiating priest, according to ancient custom; without which, he confesses, it is hard to make intelligible sense of many of their prayers that are daily used in their service.

SECT. VII.—*What Attempt was made to restore frequent and full Communions at the Reformation.*

Some attempt was made by the first reformers to rectify these abuses, and restore frequent and general communions in many places: and they, happily, carried their point so far, as to abolish private masses in all places. But the restoring the ancient way of the whole Church's communicating every Lord's day, was a matter not so easy to be effected: partly by reason of the prejudices which men had imbibed by the prevalency and long duration of contrary custom; and partly by reason of that affection which men retain for their vices, which will not suffer them to comply with an institution, that requires a constant purity of soul, and a conscience always void of offence, to qualify them for a worthy reception of a weekly or daily communion. Calvin laboured hard, at his first coming to Geneva, to establish a monthly or a weekly communion, as most agreeable to the practice of the apostles and the Primitive Church. He

^x Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. ii. c. xvii. n. ii. In missa solemnī retenta est ab aliquibus ecclesiis ministrorum, quæ Romæ nunc permanet in insignioribus basilicis, et ubi desierat, apostolicæ visitationis decreto restituta est. Sapientissimo sane consilio, ne in desuetudinem abeat antiquissimus ecclesiæ ritus, sine quo vix possunt intelligi, quæ in liturgicis orationibus quotidie recitantur. (Antuerp. 1777, p. 588.)

pleads earnestly for it in his Institutions,^y where he censures the Popish custom of communicating only once a-year, as most certainly the invention of the devil ; yet, after all, he could not prevail to have so much as a monthly communion settled among the people, but was overborne in his endeavours, and forced to yield to a rule, which requires the people to communicate only four times a-year. “ However,” he says,^z “ he took care to have it entered upon record, that this was an evil custom, to the intent that posterity might with more ease and liberty correct it ;” but whether it ever was corrected to this day, is what I am ignorant of. Most probably it never was, since I have had occasion to shew in another work,^a communicating only four times a-year continued to be the general standing custom in the French Church. Their discipline required no more, though they encouraged more frequent reception. The Church of England was a little happier in her attempts of this kind ; for, though her rules require the people, in general, to receive but three times a-year, as of necessary ecclesiastical obligation, yet in our cathedral churches the eucharist is ordinarily celebrated every Lord’s day, as it is also in some of the London parish churches ; and others, both in city and country, have monthly communions. Yet there remains a great deal still to be done to bring this matter to the primitive standard ; for, even in our cathedrals, the communions are very thin, and there is still room for those complaints of St. Chrysostom : “ In vain do we

^y Calvin. Institut. lib. iv. c. xvii. n. xlvi. Et sane hæc consuetudo, quæ semel quotannis communicare jubet, certissimum est diaboli inventum : cujuscumque tandem ministerio invecta fuerit. (Berol. 1835, vol. ii. p. 458.)

^z Ibid. Respons. de quibusdam Eccles. Ritibus, p. 206. Singulis mensibus cenam celebrare maxime nobis placeret : modo ne usus frequentior negligentiam pariat. Nam dum major pars a communione abstinet, quodammodo dissipatur ecclesia. Malimus tamen singulis mensibus invitari ecclesiam, quam quater duntaxat in singulos annos : ut apud nos fieri solet. Quum huc primum venirem, non distribuebatur nisi ter quotannis : et quidem ut inter cenam Pentecostes et natalis Christi, septem toti menses intercederent. Mihi placebant singuli menses : sed quum minime persuaderem, satius visum est populi infirmitati ignoscere, quam pertinacius contendere. Curavi tamen referri in Acta publica, vitiosum esse morem nostrum, ut posteris facilius esset et liberior correctio.

^a French Churches’ Apology for the Church of England, book iii. chap. xiv.

stand at the altar, in vain is the daily sacrifice offered : there are none, in a manner, that communicate. The churches are crowded to hear the sermon ; but, when the time of the holy mysteries comes, they are empty and deserted. Men are earnest to hear their fellow-servant preach an eloquent discourse ; but when Christ, the common Lord and Master of all, is ready to appear, and entertain them, they fly, though never so kindly invited, from his table." This must needs grieve the hearts of all pious servants of Christ, who stand there to minister in his name ; whilst few hearken to their admonitions, and the generality excuse themselves from communicating, as if it were no Christian duty. And, in country parishes, the matter is still more deplorable, where the despair of success deters the minister from attempting it : for here men are generally so averse to a weekly communion, that they will not be prevailed upon, with all the serious exhortations that can be used, to comply with the standing rules of the Church, which oblige them to communicate three times a-year, though the minister himself be under an obligation to present every such non-communicant as a notorious delinquent. " But, if the foundations be cast down, what can the righteous do ? " Experience tells us, it is as much labour in vain to present a negligent people for not communicating three times a-year, as it is gravely to exhort them to a weekly communion. This discouragement which ministers commonly meet with, in trying to bring men to comply with the stated rules of communicating three times a-year, by Church censures, which are wholly neglected, makes them despair of going any higher towards the perfection of the primitive practice : since they who cannot be prevailed upon by the present discipline to communicate three times a-year, are too obstinate and stubborn to hearken to any the most serious admonitions that can be used, to incline them to a weekly communion.

SECT. VIII. — *Wherein this is still deficient, and what seems yet necessary to be done, in order to reduce Communion to the Primitive Standard.*

What effectual remedy can be applied to this inveterate

disease, is not very easy to determine. Yet certainly the regaining of that which was so much the glory of the Primitive Church, and the great support of Christian innocence and piety (as frequent weekly communion most certainly was), must be a thing worthy the most serious thoughts and consideration of all those, into whose hands God has put power and authority, by a superior influence, to redress abuses, when they can safely do it to edification, and not to destruction. If I were worthy to give any advice in the case, it should be this, first, to restore the practice of the true ancient discipline; and, after that, the way would lie open to revive the practice of the true primitive way of communicating weekly every Lord's day. But it will be said, there lies an insuperable difficulty against the restoration of the ancient discipline, in the present posture of affairs: the state of the present times, and the general corruption of men's morals, will not admit of it: the Church of England has, for two hundred years, wished for the restoration of this discipline, and yet it is but an ineffective wish; for nothing is done towards introducing it, but rather things are gone backward; and there is less discipline for this last sixty years, since the times of the unhappy confusions, than there was before.—To which it may be answered, that the difficulty is certainly great, but not insuperable: for discipline is one of God's ordinances in his Church, and he appoints nothing but what is practicable in itself, if men be not wanting on their part to contribute toward the exercise of it. But to give rules in this case is a nice and tender point, and I had rather it should be done by the wisdom of others than myself. Something has already been suggested by a late learned writer on this subject,^b very useful for obtaining the end now proposed; and, therefore, I shall content myself, at present, to refer to his suggestions, and put an end to this discourse.

^b Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church, chap. iv. London, 1714.

BOOK XVI.

OF THE UNITY AND DISCIPLINE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE UNION AND COMMUNION OBSERVED IN THE
ANCIENT CHURCH.SECT. I. — *Of the Fundamental Unity of Faith, and Obedience to the Laws of Christ.*

THE design of ecclesiastical discipline being chiefly to preserve the unity of the Church in all necessary things, and keep it in purity, and free from corruption, by turning out unworthy members from her society and communion, and denying them all the privileges that belong to it; nothing will be more proper to usher in a discourse concerning the discipline of the ancient Church, than first to give a preliminary account of that union and communion which she laboured to preserve in all her members, united in one mystical body, under Christ, her universal head. And here, first of all, the unity of faith was principally insisted on, as the foundation on which all other sorts of Christian unity were built; and, next to this, they required the unity of holiness or obedience, that the Church might be one in observing all the laws and institutions of Christ. Some reckon the first sort of unity fundamental and essential to the very being of the Church;^a and all others only necessary to the well-being of it.^b But I conceive the ancients accounted both the unity of faith and obedience necessary, as fundamentals, to the very being of the Church, being both joined together, by our

^a Clagett, of Church Unity, p. 196.

^b Vid. Aug. de Unit. Eccles. c. xxi. (c. xviii. edit. Basil. 1569.) See below, note (1), pp. 375, 376.

Saviour, as the rock on which his Church should be built. For, as he says of faith, "Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," (Matth. xvi. 18), so he says of obedience to his laws, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him to a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house: and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. But every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it" (Matth. vii. 24). St. Luke, in relating the same passage, words it thus: "He that heareth, and doth not, is like a man that, without a foundation, built a house upon the earth, against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell, and the ruin of that house was great" (Luke, vi. 49). So that obedience, as well as faith, is part of that foundation upon which the Church of Christ is built: and he that retains not the unity of obedience, wants an essential part of its foundation, and is not a real living member of Christ's mystical body; but only a broken, or a withered branch of it. In regard to which, our Saviour says, in another place, "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so; he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven" (Matth. v. 19).

Upon this account, when he sent his apostles to teach all nations, he enjoined them two things, first, "To baptize them in the name (or faith) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And, secondly, "To teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them" (Matth. xxviii. 20). And, for the same reason, the ancient Church never admitted any persons to baptism (which was the ordinary door of admitting proselytes, and uniting them, as members, to the body of the Church), without first obliging them to do these two things: 1st, To make profession of the primary articles of the Christian faith; and, 2dly, To promise, or bind themselves by a strict engagement

and vow, to live in holy obedience to the laws and institutions of Christ:—as I have fully shewed in a former Book,^c treating of the necessary conditions required of men before their baptism. Where I have particularly remarked, out of St. Austin, that he wrote that excellent book, *De Fide et Operibus*, to shew the necessity of obedience and good works, as well as faith, to the being of a Christian; against some who pretended, that the profession of faith in Christ, and not the profession of obedience to his laws, was necessarily to be required of men, in order to unite them, as Christians, to the body of the Church, by baptism. They said, men were to be baptized, and united to the Church, so long as they kept the foundation of faith entire, whatever wicked works they built thereupon: for these would be purged away by certain punishments of fire, and they would obtain salvation at the last, by virtue of the foundation, which they retained. To which St. Austin replies, “That this was a false interpretation of the apostles’ meaning; and that however these men were so impudent as to charge the Church’s practice with novelty; yet it was always a firm custom obtaining in the Church, to reject professed workers of iniquity from baptism, and constantly refuse them the communion of the Church: and this was grounded upon the rules of ancient truth, which manifestly declared, ‘That they which do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God.’” Since, therefore, both faith and obedience were reckoned essentially necessary to baptism, they must be concluded equally necessary to preserve men in the real and perfect unity of the Church; unless we could suppose that any thing was necessary to make a man a Christian, that was not necessary to make or keep him a member of the Church.

If it be now inquired, what articles of faith, and what points of practice, were reckoned thus fundamental or essential to the very being of a Christian, and the union of many Christians into one body or Church; the ancients are very plain in resolving this. For as to fundamental articles of faith, the Church had them always collected, or summed up, out of Scripture, in her creeds; the profession of which was

^c Book xi. chap. vii. sect. vi.

ever esteemed both necessary on the one hand, and sufficient on the other, in order to the admission of members into the Church, by baptism; and, consequently, both necessary and sufficient to keep men in the unity of the Church, so far as concerns the unity of faith generally required of all Christians, to make them one body and one Church of believers. Upon this account, as I have had occasion to shew in a former Book,^d the Creed was commonly called, by the ancients, the *Κανών*, and *Regula Fidei*, because it was the known ‘standard or rule of faith,’ by which orthodoxy and heresy were judged and examined. If a man adhered to this rule, he was deemed an orthodox Christian, and in the union of the Catholic faith: but if he deviated from it in any point, he was esteemed as one that had cut himself off, and separated from the communion of the Church, by entertaining heretical opinions, and deserting the common faith. Thus the Fathers, in the Council of Antioch,^e charge Paulus Samosatensis with departing from the rule or canon, meaning the Creed, the rule of faith, because he denied the Divinity of Christ. Irenæus^f calls it ‘the unalterable canon,’ or ‘rule of faith;’ and says,^g “This faith was the same in all the world; men professed it with one heart and soul; for though there were different dialects in the world, yet the power of the faith was one and the same. The Churches in Germany had no other faith, or tradition, than those in Spain, or in France, or in the East, or Egypt, or Libya. Nor did the most eloquent ruler of the Church say any more than this: for no one was above his master: nor the weakest diminish any thing of this tradition. For the faith being one and the same, he that said most of it, could not enlarge it; nor he that said least, take any thing from it.” So Tertullian says,^h “There

^d Book x. chap. iii. sect. ii.

^e Epist. Conc. Antioch. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. xxx. (Vales. p. 228.) “Ὅπου δὲ ἀποστάς τοῦ κανόνος ἐπὶ κίβδηλα καὶ νόθα διδάγματα μετακλήσθην, οὐδὲν διὰ τοῦ ἔξω ὄντος τὰς πράξεις κρίνιν.”

^f Iren. lib. i. c. i. sect. xx. p. 44, 2. “Ὁ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκλινῇ ἐν ἑαυτῇ κατέχων, ὃν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐλάβη.”

^g Ibid. c. iii. p. 46, 1. Ταύτην τὴν πίστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καίποτε ἐν ἅλῃ τῇ κόσμῳ διασπαρμένη, ἱπιμαλῶς φυλάσσει, κ. τ. λ. See vol. iii. p. 337.

^h Tertul. de Veland. Virgin. c. i. p. 173, A. Regula fidei una omnino est,

is one rule of faith only, which admits of no change or alteration, that which teaches us to believe in one God Almighty, the Maker of the world, and in Jesus Christ, his Son," &c. "This rule," he says,ⁱ "was instituted by Christ himself, and there were no disputes in the Church about it, but such as heretics brought in, or such as made heretics. To know nothing beyond this, was to know all things. This faith was the rule of believing,^j from the beginning of the Gospel, and the antiquity of it was sufficiently demonstrated by the novelty of heresies, which were but of yesterday's standing in comparison of it." Cyprian says,^k "It was the law which the whole Catholic Church held; and that the Novatians themselves baptized into the same creed, though they differed about the sense of the article relating to the Church." Therefore Novatian, in his book of the Trinity,^l makes no scruple to give the Creed the same name, *regula veritatis*, 'the rule of truth.' And St. Jerom, after the same manner, disputing against the errors of the Montanists, says,^m "The first thing they differed about, was the rule of faith. For the Church believed the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be each

sola immobilis, et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi Conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, &c.

ⁱ Tertul. de Præscript. advers. Hæreticos, c. xiv. p. 207, A. Hæc regula, a Christo instituta, nullas habet apud nos quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt, et quæ hæreticos faciunt. . . . Nihil ultra [Adversus regulam] scire, omnia scire est.

^j Ibid. cont. Prax. c. ii. p. 501, B. Hanc regulam ab initio evangelii decurrisset, etiam ante priores quosque hæreticos, nedum ante Praxeam hesternum, probabit tam ipsa posteritas omnium hæreticorum, quam ipsa novellitas Praxeæ hesterni.

^k Cyprian. Epist. lxi. al. lxxvi. ad Magnum, p. 183, (p. 296, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat, 'eamdem Novatianum legem tenere, quam Catholica ecclesia teneat,' eodem symbolo quo et nos, baptizare, &c. . . . sciat, quisquis hoc opponendum putat; primum, non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem. Nam quum dicunt, 'Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per sanctam ecclesiam;' mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.

^l Novat. de Trinit. c. i. Regula exigit veritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum Omnipotentem, &c.—Cap. ix. Eadem regula veritatis docet nos, credere post Patrem etiam in Filium Dei, &c.

^m Hieron. Epist. liv. ad Marcellam. Primum in fidei regula discrepamus. Nos Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, in sua unumquemque persona ponimus, licet substantia copulemus: illi, Sabellii dogma sectantes, Trinitatem in unius personæ angustias cogunt. (Venet. i. 89.)

distinct in his own person, though united in substance. But the Montanists, following the doctrine of Sabellius, contracted the Trinity into one person." From all which it is evident, that the fundamental articles of faith were those which the Primitive Church summed up in her creeds, in the profession of which she admitted men as members into the unity of her body, by baptism. And if any deserted or corrupted this faith, they were no longer reputed Christians, but heretics, who brake the unity of the Church, by breaking the unity of the faith, though they had otherwise made no further separation from her communion. For, as Clemens Alexandrinus says out of Hermes Pastor,^a "Faith is the virtue that binds and unites the Church together." Whence Hegesippus, the ancient historian, giving an account of the old heretics, says,^o "They divided the unity of the Church, by pernicious speeches against God and his Christ:" that is, by denying some of the prime, fundamental articles of faith. He that makes a breach upon any one of these, cannot maintain the unity of the Church, nor his own character as a Christian. "We ought, therefore," says Cyprian,^p "in all things, to hold the unity of the Catholic Church, and not to yield, in any thing, to the enemies of faith and truth. For he cannot be thought a Christian,^q who continues not in the truth of Christ's Gospel and faith." "If men be heretics," says Tertullian,^r "they cannot be Christians." The like is said by Lactantius, and Jerom, and Athanasius, and Hilary, and many others of the ancients, whose sense upon this matter I have fully represented in another place.^s As, therefore, there was a unity

^a Clem. Stromat. lib. ii. p. 454, edit. Oxon. Ἡ συνίχουσα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀρετὴ, ἡ πίστις ἰστί.—Hermes Pastor, lib. i. vision. iii. c. viii. Prima earum, quæ (turrin nempe ecclesiam) continet manu, fides vocatur: per hanc salvi fient electi Dei.

^o Hegesip. ap. Euseb. lib. iv. c. xxii. Ἐμίχσαν τὴν ἑωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας φθοριμαίαις λόγοις κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. (Vales. 116.)

^p Cyprian. Epist. lxxi. ad Quintum, p. 194, (p. 303, edit. Amstelod.) Idcirco, per omnia debemus ecclesiæ Catholicæ unitatem tenere, nec in aliquo fidei et veritatis hostibus cedere.

^q Ibid. de Unit. Eccles. p. 114, (p. 82, edit. cit.) Nec Christianus videri potest, qui non permanet in evangelii ejus et fidei veritate.

^r Tertul. de Præscript. c. xxxvii. Si hæretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt.

^s Book i. chap. iii. sect. iv.

of faith necessary to be maintained in certain fundamental articles, in order to make a man a Christian ; so these articles were always to be found in the Church's creeds ; the profession of which was esteemed keeping the unity of the faith ; and deviating in any point from them, was esteemed a breach of that one faith, and a virtual departing from the unity of the Church.

As to the other points of obedience to the laws and institutions of Christ, which were reckoned fundamental and essential to the being of a Christian, and the unity of the Church, they were generally summed up in those short forms of "renouncing the devil and his service, and his works, and covenanting with Christ to live by the rules of his Gospel." By which they understood the renouncing all gross sins, such as idolatry, witchcraft, murder, injustice, intemperance, uncleanness, and whatever might be called worldly and fleshly lusts, contrary to the general tenour of the Gospel, and "the grace of God, which had appeared unto all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world." They that walked after this rule, and squared their lives by these general measures and lines of duty, "adding to their faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity ;" these were the true Israel of God, and in the perfect unity of his Church. As long as they did these things they could never fall : nothing could separate them from his Church, or from the love of God in Christ Jesus : "For so an entrance was ministered to them abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." But if men went contrary to this rule, "Walking in the works of the flesh, and not of the Spirit, professing to know God, but in works denying him ;" though they might be corporeally and externally united to the visible body of the Church, yet internally and spiritually they were divided from it. St. Austin^t says

^t Aug. de Unit. Eccles. c. xxi. (c. xviii. tom. vii. opp. p. 551, edit. Basil.)
Quum boni et mali dent et accipiant baptismi sacramentum, nec regenerati

expressly, "That though men were regenerated by baptism, yet none but the good were spiritually built up into the body and members of Christ: the good only compose that Church, of which it is said, 'As the lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters' (Cant. ii. 2). That Church consists only of those who build upon the rock; that is, who hear the words of Christ, and do them. They, therefore, are not of that Church who build upon the sand; that is, who hear the words of Christ, and do them not. And as they, who by the ligaments of charity are incorporated into the building that is founded upon the rock, and into the lily that shines among thorns, 'shall inherit the kingdom of God;' so they who build upon the sand, and are numbered among the thorns, shall as certainly not 'inherit the kingdom of God.'" A little after, reciting those words of the apostle (Gal. v.),^u "The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and suchlike; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" he adds, "All those are not in the lily, nor upon the rock: and heretics are in that number." Again, speaking of the grace of the Spirit, which sanctifies good men,^x he

spiritaliter in corpus et membra Christi coëdificantur nisi boni, profecto in bonis est illa ecclesia, cui dicitur, 'Sicut lilium in medio spinarum, ita proxima mea in medio filiarum.' (Cant. ii. 2.) In his est enim, qui ædificant super petram, id est, qui audiunt verba Christi et faciunt. . . . Non est ergo in eis, qui ædificant super arenam, id est, qui audiunt verba Christi, et non faciunt. . . . Qui ergo compage caritatis incorporati sunt ædificio super petram constituto, et lilio inter spinas candenti, ipsi utique possidebunt regnum Dei. Qui autem super arenam ædificant, vel in spinis deputantur, quis dubitaverit, quod regnum Dei non possidebunt? (ix. p. 257, C.)

^u Aug. de Unit. Eccles. c. xxii. (c. xviii. p. 551.) Manifesta sunt opera carnis, quæ sunt fornicationes, immunditiæ, luxuriæ, idolorum servitus, veneficia, inimicitiae, contentiones, æmulationes, animositates, dissensiones, hæreses, invidiæ, ebrietates, comessationes, et his similia, quæ prædico vobis, sicut prædixi, quoniam qui talia agunt, regnum Dei non possidebunt. Omnes itaque isti non sunt in lilio, nec super petram: inter hos autem et hæretici positi sunt. (257, E.)

^x Ibid. c. xxiii. (c. xix. p. 155.) Hoc deest omnibus malignis et gehennæ filiis, etiamsi Christi baptismo baptizentur, sicut Simon fuerat baptizatus. (259, E.)

says, "This is wanting in all the wicked, and sons of hell, although they be baptized with the baptism of Christ, as Simon Magus was baptized." "There are many such^y who communicate in the sacraments with the Church, and yet they are not now in the Church. Such are cut off before they be visibly excommunicated; and, if they be visibly excommunicated, and visibly restored to communion, if they come with a feigned mind, and a heart opposing the truth and the Church, they are not reconciled; they are not inserted into the Church, although the solemnity of reconciliation be performed upon them." In another place he says,^z "The wicked multitude of the Church are not reckoned to be in the Church, save only so far as they have the same sacraments in common with the saints, because they have only a form of godliness, but deny the power of it." He repeats the same frequently in his books against Cresconius,^a and other places, which it is needless here to repeat at length. I only observe, that as charity was reckoned one

^y Aug. de Unit. Eccles. c. xxv. (c. xx. p. 559.) Multi tales sunt in sacramentorum communione cum ecclesia, et tamen jam non sunt in ecclesia. Alioquin si tunc quisque præceditur, quum visibiliter excommunicatur, consequens erit, ut tunc rursus inseratur, quum visibiliter communioni restituitur. Quid si ergo fictus accedat, atque adversus veritatem et ecclesiam cor inimicissimum gerat, quamvis peragatur in eo illa solemnitas, numquid reconciliatur, numquid inseritur? Absit. (262, C.)

^z Ibid. c. xiii. (c. xii. p. 534.) Sermo divinus impias turbas ecclesiæ, quæ nec in ecclesia deputantur, tamen propter sacramenta, quæ cum sanctis communiter habent, quia in eis inest quædam forma pietatis, cujus virtutem negant: sicut ait apostolus, 'Habentes formam pietatis, virtutem autem ejus abnegantes,' sic redarguit, tamquam omnes tales sint, et nullus bonus omnino remanserit. (245, D. 5.)

^a Ibid. cont. Crescon. lib. i. c. xxix. Non existimo, &c. See sect. ii. note (b).—Lib. ii. c. xv. (vol. ix. 284, E.) Ista quippe in baptizatis et baptizantibus visibili baptismo reperiuntur. Ad illum tamen fontem proprium, cui nemo communicat alienus; ad illum fontem signatum, hoc est, ad Spiritus Sancti donum, quo caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris, nullus istorum nisi mutatus accedit, ita omnino mundandus, ut non sit alienus, sed sit cœlestis particeps pacis, sanctæ socius unitatis, plenus individue caritatis, civis angelicæ civitatis.—Cap. xxi. (287.) Qui mente perversa videtur intus esse, quum foris sit, ab ipso Christo jam judicatus est. . . . Omnia quippe ista monstra absit omnino ut in membris illius columbæ unicæ computentur: absit ut intrare possint limites horti conclusi, cujus ille custos est, qui non potest falli.—Cap. xxxiii. (293, E.) Nec propter malos, qui videntur esse intus, deserendi sunt boni, qui vere sunt intus.—Cap. xxxiv. (294, A.) Qui (mali) quum sint a bonis vita moribusque spiritaliter separati, corporaliter tamen eis in ecclesia videntur esse permixti usque in diem judicii, quo etiam corporaliter debitas separabuntur ad pœnas.

essential part of a Christian's virtue (our Saviour having made it the characteristic note of his disciples, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another"); so the ancients laid a great stress upon this one virtue, without which they never reputed any man to be truly in the unity of the Church, whatever claim he could otherwise lay to the communion of it.

SECT. II. — *Of the Unity of Love and Charity, as an essential Part of Christian Obedience.*

"I do not think any man," says St. Austin,^b "so vain and foolish, as to believe such a one to appertain to the unity of the Church, who has not charity. For St. James, speaking against those who thought it sufficient to believe, but would not do good works, says, 'Thou believest that there is one God; thou dost well: the devils also believe, and tremble.' Certainly the devils are not in the unity of the Church; and yet we cannot say, they believe otherwise of Christ than the Church believes, seeing they said to the Lord Jesus Christ himself, 'What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God?' And St. Paul says, 'Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.'" "They that are enemies to this brotherly charity," says St. Austin again,^c "whether they are openly out of the Church, or seem to be within, they are false Christians, and Antichrists. When they seem to be

^b Aug. cont. Crescon. lib. i. c. xxix. Non existimo quemquam ita desipere, ut credat ad ecclesiæ pertinere unitatem eum, qui non habet caritatem. . . . De fide etiam Jacobus apostolus quum loqueretur adversus eos, qui sibi quod crediderant sufficere arbitrabantur, et bene operari nolebant; 'Tu credis,' inquit, 'quoniam unus Deus est: bene facis, et dæmones credunt, et contremiscunt.' Nempe in unitate ecclesiæ dæmones non sunt; nec ideo tamen possumus dicere aliud esse quod credunt, quum et Domino Jesu dixerint, 'Quid nobis et tibi est, Fili Dei?' Unde Paulus apostolus, 'Si habeam,' inquit, 'omnem fidem, ita ut montes transferam, et caritatem non habeam, nihil sum.' (Bened. ix. p. 276, B.)

^c Ibid. de Bapt. lib. iii. c. xix. (Benedict. ix. p. 80, D.) Hujus fraternæ caritatis inimici, sive aperte foris sint, sive intus esse videantur, pseudochristiani sunt et antichristi. Inventis enim occasionibus foras exeunt. . . . Sed etiam si occasiones desint, quum intus videntur, ab illa invisibili caritatis compage separati sunt. Unde Joannes dicit, 'Ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis.' Non ait, quod exeundo alieni facti sunt, sed quod alieni erant, propter hoc eos exisse declaravit.

within, they are separated from that invisible union, or bond of charity; whence St. John says of them, 'They went out from us, but they were not of us.' He does not say they were made aliens by going out; but because they were aliens before, he declares that, therefore, they went out." This charity was necessary to incorporate men into that building,^d which was founded upon the rock of obedience, without which it could not stand. To uphold the structure, charity was required as a principal part of the foundation, whereupon the whole building rested, being fitly framed together, and united by charity into one, as members of the mystical body of Christ.

SECT. III.—*Other Sorts of Unity necessary to the Well-being of the Church.*

After this manner, the ancients commonly discoursed of these sorts of unity, which I call fundamental to the very being of a Church; being so absolutely necessary and essential, as that the Church could not consist without them. They were necessary to every individual, and necessary in all cases and circumstances whatsoever: there being no case, in which it was lawful to deny the faith; nor any case that could dispense with a man's obligations to sobriety, godliness, righteousness, and charity. There were other sorts of unity, necessary indeed to the well-being of the Church, but yet not so absolutely essential, but that a man, in some extraordinary cases and circumstances, might be incapacitated or hindered in the actual performance of them, without incurring the censure of breaking the unity of the Church, or being wholly excluded out of her communion. It is every Christian's duty to unite himself to the Church by baptism, and to receive it from the hands of a regular ministry; it is his duty to join in communion with the Church where he lives, and assemble with them for worship and prayers, and administration of the word and sacraments, and all other holy offices; it is his duty to live under the government of a regular and lawful ministry, and submit

^d Aug. de Unit. c. xxi. (c. xviii.) *Compagne caritatis incorporati sunt ædificio super petram constituto.*

himself to all the rules of the Church in worship and discipline, that are not contrary or repugnant to the word of God. But, then, it may happen, that a man cannot have baptism, though he be never so desirous of it; sudden death may prevent him, whilst he is seriously preparing for it. In this case, the Church did not deny him her communion, though he was never formally entered into it; but accepted the will for the deed, and treated him, after death, as one of her sons, dying in her bosom and communion. Which was the case of many martyrs, and others, dying without baptism; not out of contempt, but by the exigence of some unforeseen accident preventing them. So, again, it might happen, that a man in extremity, when he was desirous of baptism, could not have it but from the hands of a heretic or a layman. In this case, the Church was equally favourable to the party so baptized, because he was united in heart and will to the Church; and it was not contempt of her ministry, but necessity, that drove him to receive baptism from a heretic or a layman, rather than die without it. In like manner, a man that was very desirous to join with the Church in her public assemblies, might, notwithstanding, by some great exigence, be debarred from this privilege, as by sickness, or imprisonment, or banishment: in which case he was not divided from the communion of the Church in worship or prayers; but his spirit was still present in her religious assemblies, though necessity obliged him, in body, to be absent from them. Or, if it were but the care of the indigent that required his help, and kept him away from the solemn meeting in God's house, his reason was good, and such an act was no breach of Christian unity, because God himself allows it, nay, requires it by his own rule: "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice;" which, in such cases, where men act sincerely, and trifle not with God, is always their justification both before God and his Church. It was further required, that men should comply with all the innocent customs and lawful orders of the Church, and especially submit to her discipline, in case of any scandalous transgression or immorality. But if men, by reason of sickness, or infirmity, or old age, could not observe her rules about

fasting ; or, by reason of their poverty, could not abstain from their ordinary labour to attend her festivals ; these were not reckoned transgressions of her rules, or good order, because they naturally admitted of such limitations and exceptions. And no man was accused, as a divider of the Church's unity, for going against her customs in such cases. So, though it was required that penitents under discipline should be reconciled to the Church by imposition of hands and absolution, yet if any real penitent, who was desirous of absolution, happened to be struck dumb, or die before he could receive it, this was reckoned no prejudice to his condition. In this case, his good-will, and desire, and intention of being reconciled, were reputed sufficient to restore him to the peace and unity of the Church, though he wanted the formality of an external absolution.

This was the great difference between those sorts of unity, which were reckoned fundamental and essential to the very being of a Church, and those which were required as necessary to the well-being of it. The former admitted of no dispensations ; but the latter did, in these and the like cases. No case could dispense with a man's putting away a good conscience, or making shipwreck of faith ; no necessity could be so great as to justify a man in denying an essential or fundamental truth, or in living in open and professed violation of those necessary rules and great lines of duty, which require the practice of universal holiness in a godly, righteous, sober life, as the indispensable condition of salvation ; but several necessities might dispense with men in the non-observance of the things of the latter kind : and, therefore, it is of great use carefully to distinguish these things in speaking of the unity of the Church. As, therefore, I have spoken particularly of the former, so I will now speak a little more distinctly of these latter, and shew how far the ancients urged the necessity of them.

SECT. IV. — *Among these they reckoned, First, The necessary Use of one Baptism, ordinarily to be administered by the Hands of a regular Ministry.*

And here, first of all, they required, that men should

unite themselves to the Church by baptism; and that administered but once; and this also to be administered ordinarily by the hands of a regular ministry, except some urgent necessity obliged them to do otherwise. The necessity of baptism they urged from the tenour of the commission given to the apostles, "Go, baptize all nations;" and from those words of our Saviour (John iii. v.), "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." There were many heretics who contemned the use of water-baptism, as a carnal ordinance, and wholly denied the necessity of it to salvation in any case whatsoever; of whom I have given a particular account in a former Book.* Against these they urged the necessity of baptism in all ordinary cases, to make men members of the Church; and strenuously maintained, that men who wilfully neglected or despised baptism, could not by any other means be united to the Church of Christ, or have any grounds for hope of eternal life; because they despised that ordinance of Christ, which he had made the regular and ordinary way of admitting members into his Church, and refused to enter by that door, which he had appointed to be the general entrance to eternal life. This opinion of the ancients, concerning the necessity of baptism in all ordinary cases, maintained against those several heresies, the reader may find fully discoursed in a foregoing part of this work;† where I observed, that though they strictly urged the necessity of baptism, in order to make men members of the Church, and sons of God; expressing themselves severely against all that either carelessly neglected it, or profanely despised it; yet they did not believe it to be so simply and absolutely necessary as the unity of faith and repentance: because they always maintained, that the bare want of baptism, where there was no contempt, might be supplied by martyrdom; where the exhibiting of faith, and the greatest testimony of obedience that could be given, was sufficient to unite them to Christ and his Church in that case, and grant them all the privileges of Christian communion. And the like was deter-

* Book xi. chap. ii.

† Book x. chap. ii. sect. xix. xx.

mined concerning the faith and repentance of such catechumens as were piously preparing for baptism, but were snatched away by sudden death before they had any opportunity to receive it. Which shews, that they put a manifest difference between the unity of faith and obedience, as fundamental and essential to the very being of a Church, the want of which nothing could supply; and the unity of baptism, which, though ordinarily necessary to the well-being of the Church, yet was not so absolutely necessary and essential, but that the want of it might be supplied, in some cases, by faith and obedience: and by these a martyr, or a pious catechumen, might be presumed to die in the unity of the Church without baptism, when they had no opportunity to receive it.

The form of baptism itself, indeed, whenever it was administered, was a little more necessary, because that implied a profession of faith in the Holy Trinity, and universal obedience to the laws of Christ; and therefore baptism, administered in any other form, was reputed null and void, even in the Church itself, and was of necessity to be repeated. But, then, this necessity did not rise from the bare necessity of baptism (which might, as we have heard, be dispensed with in some cases), but from the necessity of faith and obedience, presupposed as antecedent qualifications, essential to the very being of a Church, and the character of a Christian, in the largest denomination. So that what made this so absolutely necessary, was not the absolute necessity of baptism itself, which might be dispensed with in some extraordinary cases, where those qualifications were really in the hearts of men before baptism. But it was the want of those qualifications, or, at least, the want of professing them in due form, that made the baptism void; because there was a strong presumption, that they had not those qualifications that were essential to the very being of a Christian, since no profession was made of them in their baptism. For which reason, whether it was given in the Church, or out of the Church, it was always to be repeated, as a thing null and void, for want of those qualifications of

faith and obedience, which were so indispensably required to make a man a Christian.

It was necessary, also, to the unity of the Church, in its well-being, that baptism should ordinarily be administered only by the hands of a regular ministry: and, therefore, for either laymen, without a commission in the Church, to usurp this authority, or for heretics and schismatics without the Church to assume this power, was always esteemed a great breach of the Church's unity. And though the Church did not always annul such baptisms, if given in due form of words; yet she always condemned the thing as a usurpation, and an act of criminal schism, and manifest prevarication, both in the giver and voluntary receiver. Insomuch that one of the ancient councils order,^a "That if any Catholic offered his children to be baptized by heretics, his oblation should not be received in the Church." This was in effect to punish him with excommunication, as an encourager of heretics, and a divider of the unity of the Church. And St. Jerom says, to the same purpose,^b "If a man who is orthodox in his own faith, is wittingly and willingly baptized by heretics, he deserves no pardon for his crime." But then it might happen, that a man in extremity might be so distressed as to have none but a heretic to baptize him; in which case, to receive baptism from the hands of a heretic or schismatic, was reckoned no breach of catholic unity, because the man, in heart and mind, was still united to the Catholic Church. This is St. Austin's resolution of the case. "If a man," says he,ⁱ "is compelled

^a Conc. Ilerdens. c. xiii. Catholicus, qui filios suos in hæresi baptizandos obtulerit, oblatio illius in ecclesia nullatenus recipiatur.

^b Hieron. Dialog. cum Lucifer. c. v. Si jam ipse bene credebat, et sciens ab hæreticis baptizatus est, erroris veniam non meretur.

ⁱ Aug. de Bapt. lib. i. c. ii. (Benedict. ix. p. 54, B. C.) Si quem forte coëgerit extrema necessitas, ubi Catholicum per quem accipiat, non invenit, et in animo pace Catholica custodita, per aliquem extra unitatem Catholicam positum acceperit, quod erat in ipsa Catholica unitate accepturus, si statim etiam de hac vita emigraverit, non eum nisi Catholicum deputamus. Si autem fuerit a corporali morte liberatus, quum se Catholicæ congregationi etiam corporali præsentia reddiderit, unde numquam corde discesserat, non solum non improbamus quod fecit, sed etiam securissime verissimeque laudamus: quia præsentem Deum credidit

by extreme necessity, where he cannot have a Catholic to give him baptism, to take it at the hands of one who is not in Catholic unity; in that case we reckon him no other than a Catholic still, though he died immediately, because he was in heart and mind a Catholic, and would have been baptized in Catholic unity, if there had been any opportunity to have done it. If such a one survives, and corporally joins himself to the Catholic congregation, from which, in heart, he never departed, we not only not disallow what he has done, but securely and truly commend him for it: because he believed God to be present in his heart, where he preserved unity, and would not depart out of this life without the sacrament of baptism, which he knew to be God's, and not men's, wheresoever he found it. But if any one, when he might receive it in the Catholic Church, by some perverseness of mind, chooses rather to be baptized in schism, though he afterward design to return to the Church, because he is certain the sacrament will profit him in the Church, but not elsewhere, though he may receive it elsewhere; this is a perverse and wicked man, and so much the more perniciously such, by how much the more knowing he is." In another place he proposes the same question, Whether a Catholic, without breach of unity, might receive baptism from a schismatic? And he answers it after the same manner,^k "That he may safely receive it of a Separatist, if he himself be no Separatist when he receives it: for so it often

cordi suo, ubi unitatem servabat; et sine sancti baptismi sacramento, quod ubicumque invenit, non hominum sed Dei esse cognovit, noluit ex hac vita migrare. Si quis autem, quum possit in ipsa Catholica accipere, per aliquam mentis perversitatem eligit in schismate baptizari; etiamsi postea venire ad Catholicam cogitat, quia certus est ibi prodesse sacramentum, quod alibi accipi quidem potest, prodesse autem non potest; procul dubio perversus et iniquus est, et tanto perniciosius, quanto scientius.

^k Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. v. (vol. ix. p. 110, C. 7.) Potest salubriter accipere [i. e. a separato], si ipse non separatus accipiat: sicut plerisque accidit, ut Catholico animo et corde ab unitate pacis non alienato, aliqua necessitate mortis urgentis in aliquem hæreticum irruerent, et ab eo Christi baptismum sine illius perversitate perciperent, et sive defuncti, sive liberati, nequaquam apud eos remanerent, ad quos numquam corde transierant. Si autem etiam ipse separatus acceperit, tanto perniciosius accipit, quanto majus bonum est, quod non bene accipit: et tanto magis valet ad exitium separato, quanto magis posset ad salutem valere conjuncto.

happens to men who have a Catholic mind, and a heart no-ways alienated from the unity of peace, that, in extreme necessity, and danger of imminent death, they light upon some heretic, and receive the baptism of Christ at his hands, but not with the perverseness or heretical pravity of the administrator. For whether they die or live, they do not remain among heretics, to whom, in heart, they never went over. So again, distinguishing baptized persons into three sorts; 1st. Such as are baptized in the house of God, and are truly and spiritually of the house of God; 2d. Such as are baptized in the house of God, but are spiritually, by wicked works, separated from it; 3d. Such as are baptized in heresy or schism, who are corporally separated from the house of God, and worse than those who live carnally within it, and are only spiritually divided from it;" he adds concerning this last sort (who are rather to be said to be of the house of God, than in it, being further separated by corporal division, than those who are only spiritually divided from it),¹ that "they neither have baptism to any profit themselves, neither is it received with any profit from them, except where the necessity of receiving it, forces a man to receive it from them, and the mind of the receiver does noways recede from the bond of unity." By which is intimated, that to receive baptism, in case of necessity, from the hands of a heretic or schismatic, does not involve a man in the guilt of schism, so long as it is a case of extreme necessity; and the man, in heart and mind, is all the time in the unity of the Catholic Church.

The case was the same with those that were baptized by laymen. The rules of the Church required, that none should baptize, in ordinary cases, but the regular and lawful ministers of the Church; and to do otherwise, was always a note of criminal schism. But, in case of extremity, she granted a general commission even to laymen to baptize, rather than any person in such an exigence should die

¹ Aug. de Bapt. lib. vii. c. lii. Qui separationes, non magis in domo quam ex domo sunt, neque omnino utiliter habent (i. e. baptismum), neque ab eis utiliter accipitur, nisi forte accipiendi necessitas urgeat, et accipientis animus ab unitatis vinculo non recedat. (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 136, B. 7.)

without baptism : and, in such a case, to receive baptism from a layman, was neither usurpation nor schism in the giver or receiver, because they had the Church's authority for the action. I produce no proofs or evidence for this here, because I have done it fully in a separate discourse before, treating historically of the practice of the Church, in reference to her allowance of baptism administered by laymen, in cases extraordinary, when men were in apparent danger of death, and could not have a minister to baptize them.

In all these cases, we see nothing but extreme necessity could excuse men from criminal schism, in dividing themselves from the Church, either by the neglect of baptism, or seeking to heretics, or schismatics, or laymen, for the administration of it. And the like is to be said of any man's suffering himself to be rebaptized, after he had once received a true baptism, whether in the Church or out of it. For the unity of baptism was such, that it was never to be repeated. The greatest apostates were never rebaptized by the Catholic Church upon their admission again, but taken in by imposition of hands and absolution, upon their repentance. Neither did the Church ever rebaptize those that were baptized in heresy or schism ; except when some doubt was made, whether the baptism was defective in some essential part of it. And, therefore, because many heretics were inclined to rebaptize the Catholics, very severe laws were made, both in Church and state, to repress this insolence ; of which I have given a particular account in handling the subject of baptism heretofore ;^m and need only now observe, that this practice of rebaptizing was always esteemed a schismatical act, and a notorious breach of Catholic unity, which never allowed of more than one baptism, according to that rule of the apostle, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," in the Church, as many of the ancients expound it ; or, at least because, by the Divine will, it was so appointed.

^m Book xii. chap. v. sect. vii.

SECT. V.—*Secondly, The Unity of Worship, in joining with the Church in Prayers, and Administration of the Word and Sacraments.*

2. Another sort of unity, requisite to the well-being of the Church, was the unity of worship, whereby all Christians were obliged to join with their respective Churches in the performance of all holy offices in public: such as common prayer, and the administration of the word and sacraments. Which did not require that all Churches should exactly agree in the same form of words, which were not essential to these things (for, as we shall presently see, every Church was at liberty to make choice for herself, in what method and form of words she would perform these things; and it was no breach of unity for different Churches to have different modes, and circumstances, and ceremonies, in performing the same holy offices, so long as they kept to the substance of the institution): but that which was required to keep the unity of the Church in these matters, was, that every particular member of any Church, should comply with the particular customs and usages of his own Church (nothing being inserted into her offices that was unlawful); and meet for religious worship; and hold constant communion with her in the performance of all Divine service. And to do otherwise, either by neglecting wholly the service of religious assemblies, or setting up opposite communions, or raising unnecessary disputes about the lawful usages and innocent practices of the Church whereof a man was a member, was always esteemed an act of criminal schism, as giving scandal and offence to the Church and his brethren. There are several canons in the Council of Gangra, made against the Separatists called Eustathians, directly to this purpose. The fourth canon runs thus: " If any one separate from a married presbyter, upon pretence that it is unlawful to partake of the oblation when he performs the liturgy, or celebrates the office of communion, let him be anathema;" that is, declared excommunicate, or cut off from the Church. The

ⁿ Conc. Gangrens. c. iv. Εἴ τις διακρίνεται παρὰ πρεσβυτέρου γιγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι λυτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ προσφορᾷ μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἴστω. (Labbe. ii. 419.)

fifth canon is to the same effect :^o “ If any one teach that the house of God, and the assemblies held therein, are to be despised, let him be anathema.” The sixth forbids all private and irregular assemblies :^p “ If any hold other assemblies privately out of the church ; and, contemning the Church, will have ecclesiastical offices performed without a presbyter licensed by the bishop, let him be anathema.” The eleventh^q censures those, in like manner, who despised the feasts of charity, made in honour of the Lord, refusing to partake of them. The eighteenth^r censures such as fasted on the Lord’s day, under pretence of leading an ascetic life ; this being a thing contrary to the general rule and custom of the Church. The nineteenth,^s on the other hand, censures such ascetics, as, without the excuse of bodily infirmity, out of mere pride contemptuously broke the common fasts handed down, by tradition, to be observed in the Church. And the twentieth canon^t anathematizes those, who, from an insolent disposition, contemned the assemblies that were wont to be held in the churches of the martyrs, and the service performed there, and the commemorations of them. Among the Apostolical Canons, there is one to the same purpose, which orders,^u “ That if any presbyter, despising his bishop, gather

^o Conc. Gangrens. c. v. Εἴ τις διδάσκει, τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγκαταφρόνητον εἶναι, καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ συναῖς, ἀνάθημα ἔστω. (Labbe. ii. 419.)

^p Ibid. c. vi. Εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάῳ, καὶ καταφρονῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑβόλαι πράττειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθημα ἔστω.

^q Ibid. c. xi. Εἴ τις καταφρονήσει τῶν ἐκ πίστεως ἀγάπας ποιοούντων, καὶ διὰ τιμὴν τοῦ Κυρίου συγκυκαλοῦντων τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἑβόλαι κοινωνεῖν ταῖς κλήσεσι, διὰ τὸ ἐξουσιάζειν τὸ γινόμενον, ἀνάθημα ἔστω.

^r Ibid. c. xviii. Εἴ τις διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ νηστεύει, ἀνάθημα ἔστω. (P. 423.)

^s Ibid. c. xix. Εἴ τις τῶν ἀσκουμένων χωρὶς σωματικῆς ἀνάγκης ὑπερηφανεύεται, καὶ τὰς παραδιδόμενας νηστείας εἰς τὸ ποινὸν, καὶ φυλασσομένας ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, παρελθεῖ, ἀπακυροῦντες ἐν αὐτῷ τελίου λογισμοῦ, ἀνάθημα ἔστω.

^t Ibid. c. xx. Εἴ τις αἰτιῶτο, ὑπερηφάνῃ διαβίῳ κίχρημινος καὶ βδελυστόμινος τὰς συναῖς τῶν μαρτυρῶν, ἢ τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς γινόμενας λειτουργίας, καὶ τὰς μνήμας αὐτῶν, ἀνάθημα ἔστω.

^u Can. Apost. xxx. Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος καταφρονήσας τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, χωρὶς συναγάγῃ, καὶ θυσιαστήριον ἔτιρον πῆξῃ, μηδὲν κατιγνωκὼς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἐν ἐπιστάτῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καθαιρεῖσθω ὡς φίλαρχος· τύραννος γὰρ ἔστιν· καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοὶ, ὅσοι ἂν αὐτῷ προσβῶνται· οἱ δὲ λαϊκοὶ ἀφωριζέσθωσαν ταῦτα δὲ μὲν μίαν καὶ διευτέραν, καὶ τρίτην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου παράκλησιν γινέσθω. (Labbe. i. 31.)

a separate congregation, and erect another altar, having nothing to object against his bishop, in point of godliness or righteousness, he should be deposed, as a lover of pre-eminence, and arbitrary power, or tyranny, in the Church." And if any one of the clergy conspired with him, they were likewise to be deposed, and laymen to be suspended from the communion, after a third admonition given them from the bishop. These were some of the ancient rules relating to Separatists dividing wholly from the Church, and refusing contemptuously to communicate with her in Divine service. And for such as frequented some part of the service, but fell off from the rest, she set an equal mark of reproach upon them, as disobedient children also. One of the Apostolical Canons* orders all communicants, who came to church to hear the Scriptures read, but did not stay to join in prayers and receiving the eucharist, to be suspended, as authors of confusion and disorder in the Church. And the Council of Antioch repeats and reinforces this canon.† The Council of Eliberis‡ forbids the bishop to receive the oblations of such as did not communicate: which was in effect to cut them off from communion with the Church, for the neglect of that principal part of Divine service. The same Council, in another canon, orders,§ "That if any one, being at home in his own city, did, for three Lord's days together, absent himself from church, he should be suspended from the communion for an equal term, that he might be made sensible of his crime by the Church's censure." The Council of Sardica,

* Can. Apost. ix. p. 27. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας πιστοὺς [εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τῶν] [ἱερῶν] γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ παραμένοντας δι' τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ μεταλήψει, ὡς ἀταξίαν ἱμποιοῦντας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀφορίζεσθαι χρεῖ.

† Conc. Antioch. c. ii. Πάντας τοὺς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν γραφῶν ἀκούοντας, μὴ κοινωνοῦντας δι' εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ, ἢ ἀποστρεφόμενους τὴν μεταλήψιν τῆς εὐχαριστίας κατὰ τινὰ ἀταξίαν· τούτους ἀποβλήτους γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὡς ἂν ἰξμολογησάμενοι, καὶ διέξαντες καρποὺς μετανοίας, καὶ παρακαλίσαντες, τυγχίῃν δυνῆσθαι συγγνώμης.

‡ Conc. Illiber. c. xxviii. Episcopus placuit ab eo qui non communicat, munera accipere non debere.—— Conc. Tolet. I. c. xiii. Hi qui intrans in ecclesiam, et deprehenduntur numquam communicare, admoneantur, quod si non communicant, ad penitentiam accedant, &c.

§ Illib. c. xxi. Si quis, in civitate positus, tres Dominicas ad ecclesiam non accesserit [paucis], tanto tempore abstineat, ut correptus esse videatur. (Labbe. i. 973.)

not long after, made a decree to the same purpose, referring to some former canon that had been made upon this matter, which, though some learned men are at a loss to know what canon it was, seems plainly to be this canon of the Council of Eliberis. For Hosius, bishop of Corduba, was present at both these councils, and presided in that of Sardica; which makes it probable that he referred to the canon of Eliberis, when he proposed it to the fathers at Sardica, for their consent and approbation. For the Council of Sardica repeats a canon made in some former Council, importing,^b “That a layman, absenting from church for three Lord’s days together, without just cause or impediment, was to be excommunicated for his transgression.” And the same is repeated in the Council of Trullo.^c So careful was the Church to preserve her members in the unity of Divine worship, and discountenance all Separatists, whether partial or total, that an occasional communicant was liable to censure, as well as any other.

But then there were some necessary reasons that might justly excuse a man from this duty of constant communion with his own church. As if a man was in a journey, the very nature of the thing was his excuse: for he could not communicate with his own Church in such a necessity, and therefore the Council of Trullo delivers the rule with that limitation. If a man was sick and infirm, his infirmity was such an impediment as all laws, both human and Divine, would allow of as a reasonable cause of absenting. And the same reason would excuse his non-observance of the severe fasts of the Church, which were imposed upon none but those that were able to bear them, as appears from the fore-cited canon of the Council of Gangra.^d The stationary-days

^b Conc. Sardic. c. xi. Μένουσι καὶ ἐν τῷ προάγοντι χρόνῳ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν περιεῖναι, ἵνα εἴ τις λαϊκὸς ἐν πόλει διάγων, τρεῖς κυριακὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τρισὶν ἰδομασί μὴ συνέρχεται, ἀποκινεῖτο τῆς κοινωνίας. (Labbe. ii. 637, A. 5.)

^c Conc. Trul. c. lxxx. Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ τῶν ἐν πλήρῳ παταλιγομένων, ἢ λαϊκὸς, εἰ μηδεμίαν ἀνάγκην βαρύνειαν ἔχει, ἢ πρῶγμα δυσχερὲς, ὥστε ἐπὶ πλείστον ἀπολείπειν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλ’ ἐν πόλει διάγων τρεῖς κυριακὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τρισὶν ἰδομασί μὴ συνέρχεται, εἰ μὴν κληρικὸς εἴη, καθαιρέσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀποκινεῖσθω τῆς κοινωνίας. (Labbe. vi. 1177.)

^d Conc. Gangrens. c. xix. See note (*), p. 389.

of fasting and prayer were chiefly designed for the exercise of religious ascetics, those who had both strength and leisure to attend them: and, therefore, an infirm man, or a poor man who was to live by his bodily labour, was under no obligation to spend so much time in those ordinary returns of fasting and prayer. If he communicated with the Church religiously on the Lord's days, his omissions of the rest were not imputed to him as breaking communion with the Church. If men were in prison or in banishment, the necessity of their confinement was their natural excuse. For how should they join bodily in communion with the Church, who had not the liberty of their own bodies, whilst they were entirely at the mercy and disposal of others? It was sufficient for them, in such a case, to join in spirit, when they could not in bodily presence; and to say with David, "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?" (Psalm xlii. 1.) And "Wo is me, that I am constrained to dwell with Meseck, and to have my habitation among the tents of Kedar" (Psalm cxx. 5). "O God, my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth after thee, in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; to see thy power and glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary" (Psalm lxiii. 1). It was their misfortune, and not their crime, in that case, to be absent from the house of God: meanwhile the whole world was to them the temple of God: "For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:" their prison was their oratory, and the wilderness a sanctuary; their own hearts a sacrifice, and their own bodies an altar. When Lucian the martyr made use of his own breast in chains, instead of a communion-table to offer the eucharist on, his sacrifice was as acceptable to God, as if it had been in the midst of the church, upon an altar. For, as St. Basil words it,* "In such a case, it is not the place, but the mind and affection of the supplicant, that God regards. Moses was heard in the bottom of the sea; Job, upon a dunghill; Ezekias, in his bed; Jeremy, in the dungeon; Jonas, in the whale's belly; Daniel, in the lions'

* Basil. Exhortat. ad Baptism. ap. Durant. de Ritib. lib. i. c. ii.

den; the three children, in the burning fiery furnace; the penitent thief, upon the cross; and Peter and Paul, in prison." "Every place," says Dionysius of Alexandria,^f "is, instead of a temple in time of persecution, whether it be a field, or a wilderness, or a ship, or an inn, or a prison." There is a great difference to be made between necessity and contempt. If a man voluntarily absents himself from the assemblies of the Church, when he may enjoy them, he is a divider of her unity, by contemning her service: but if necessity obliges him to be absent when he is desirous to be present, he is spiritually present with her even whilst he is absent in body: which is as much preserving her unity as his case will allow, or the Church can require: seeing this sort of unity is not simply essential to the being of a Church in all states, but only necessary to her well-being in peaceable times and ordinary cases. And happy would it be for the Church, if men would never deny themselves the benefit of her communion in religious assemblies, but upon such reasons of necessity, which carry their own apology, at first sight, in their very nature: if they were merely passive, and not active, in their separation, such a separation would not involve them in the guilt of schism, being so rationally to be accounted for both before God and his Church. The Primitive Church was exceeding happy in these two things (which relate to this sort of unity in communion, the want of which is so much to be lamented, both in its causes and effects, in this unhappy divided state of the Church in later ages); 1. That no Church then ever assumed to herself an authority of imposing upon her members any things unlawful, or contrary to the word of God, either in faith or practice, as necessary terms of communion. They required no belief of any articles of faith, as necessary to salvation, but such as were contained in their common creeds, and founded upon the infallible authority of Scripture. They inserted nothing into their public forms of worship, repugnant to the word of God, or intrenching upon any Divine rule given in Scripture, about the object, or matter, or manner of adoration, as any

^f Ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. xxii. (Vales. 291, B.) Πᾶς ὁ τῆς κατ' ἑκαστον θλίψεως τόπος, πανηγυρικὸν ἡμῶν γίνεται χωρίον ἁγίου· ἐρημία ταῦς· πανδοχείον· διαμωτήριον.

one may perceive, by considering the account that has been given of their public worship and liturgy in the three last Books, where we examined every particular office of it. Things being thus secured for the substance of their worship, all Christian people, in the next place, thought it their duty to submit to the wisdom and prudence of their governors in establishing things external and circumstantial, relating to expedience, edification, and good order. And this was the second thing to be admired in the economy of the ancient Church, that the people never had any dispute with their superiors about matters of this kind ; but left all indifferent things, and things of expediency, decency, circumstance, and form, to the judgment and choice of their governors, or persons invested with authority to determine such matters ; readily complying with the innocent customs of the Church, and all the rules of public order, and never dividing into sects and parties upon the account of rites and ceremonies, though differently practised in different Churches. This was according to the wise and peaceable rule laid down by St. Austin in his advice to Casulanus : “ In those things,” says he,^s “ concerning which the Holy Scripture has given no positive direction, the custom of the people of God, or the rules of our ancestors or superiors are to be taken for a law.” He instances in the custom of the Church never to fast on the Lord’s day, which was become so much a rule, that whoever should pretend to introduce the contrary custom, to make it a fast, should be thought to give great scandal to the Church, and that not without good reason.^h “ Nay,” he says,ⁱ “ it would be to offend God, so to scandalize the universal Church by holding a fast on the Lord’s day ; especially since it was become the practice of the impious Manichees so to fast, in opposition to the Church.”^k The Saturday-fast

^s Aug. Epist. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. (tom. iii. opp. p. 378, c. edit. Basil. 1569, Benedict. vol. ii. p. 52, C. 5.) In his rebus, de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura Divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt.

^h Ibid. Quisquis hunc diem jejuniis decernendum putaverit, non parvo scandalo erit ecclesiæ ; nec immerito.

ⁱ Ibid. p. 385, a. Quis non Deum offendet, si velit cum scandalo totius, quæ ubique dilatatur, ecclesiæ, die Dominico jejunare ? (P. 56, D. 8.)

^k Ibid. p. 390, b. Die Dominico jejunare, scandalum est magnum, maxime

was not a custom of so general observation : for some Churches kept it a fast, and some a festival : but his advice as to this is much of the same nature,¹ “ That a man should observe the custom of every Church where he happened to be, if he was minded neither to give offence to them, nor take offence from them.” And this advice, he says, he had in his younger days, from the mouth of St. Ambrose. But because, in such a matter as this is, it might happen, that not only different Churches might practise differently, but also the members of the same Church might differ in their practice, one from another, without breach of communion, as it was in some of the African Churches, where, in one and the same Church, some chose to fast, others to dine upon the Sabbath; his advice to Casulanus, as a presbyter,^m was, “ To follow the custom of those who had the care and government of the Churches committed to them : resist not your bishop in such a matter as this, but follow what he does, without any scruple or disputation.”

posteaquam innotuit detestabilis multumque fidei Catholicæ Scripturisque Divinis apertissime contraria hæresis Manichæorum, qui suis auditoribus ad jejunandum istum tamquam legitimum diem constituerunt ; per quod factum est, ut jejunium diei Dominici horribilius haberetur. (P. 60, A.)

¹ Aug. Epist. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. p. 392, fin. et p. 393, a. (vol. ii. p. 61, F. 4.) Quoniam non invenimus in evangelicis et apostolicis litteris, quæ ad Novi Testamenti revelationem proprie pertinent, certis diebus aliquibus evidenter præceptum observanda esse jejunia, et ideo res quoque ista, sicut aliæ plurimæ, quas enumerare difficile est, invenit in veste illius filiæ regis, hoc est, ecclesiæ, varietatis locum ; indicabo tibi, quid mihi de hoc requirenti responderit venerandus Ambrosius, a quo baptizatus sum, Mediolanensis episcopus. Nam quum in eadem civitate mater mea mecum esset, et nobis adhuc catechumenis parum ista curantibus, ille sollicitudinem gereret, utrum secundum morem nostræ civitatis sibi esset Sabbato jejunandum, an ecclesiæ Mediolanensis more prandendum, ut hac eam cunctatione liberarem, interrogavi hoc supra dictum hominem Dei. At ille, ‘ Quid possum,’ inquit, ‘ hinc docere amplius, quam ipse facio?’ Ubi ego putaveram, nihil eum ista responsione præcepisse, nisi in Sabbato pranderemus ; hoc quippe ipsum facere sciebam : sed ille sequutus adjecit, ‘ Quando heic sum, non jejuno Sabbato ; quando Romæ sum, jejuno Sabbato : et ad quamcumque ecclesiam veneritis, ejus morem servate, si pati scandalum non vultis aut facere.’ Hoc responsum retuli ad matrem, nec dubitavit esse obediendum : hoc etiam nos sequuti sumus.

^m Ibid. eod. pag. b. Mos eorum mihi sequendus videtur, quibus eorum populorum congregatio regenda commissa est. Quapropter si consilio meo . . . libenter acquiescis, episcopô tuo in hac re noli resistere ; et quod facit ipse, sine ullo scrupulo vel disputatione sectare. (P. 62, B.)

SECT. VI.—*Thirdly, The Unity of Subjection of Presbyters and People to their Bishop, and Obedience to all Public Orders of the Church in Matters of an indifferent Nature.*

3. And this leads us to consider another sort of unity, very necessary for the well-being of the Church: which was, that the clergy and people should be united under one single bishop in every Church, paying a due respect to his authority, and not dividing from him, either by setting up anti-bishops against him, or withdrawing from his communion or government, or despising the public orders of his Church, which were made for expedience and edification in matters of an indifferent nature. Cyprian has abundance relating to this sort of unity, considering both the state of his own and other Churches. “The Church,” he says,^a “is a people united to their bishop, and a flock adhering to their pastor.” Whence he infers, that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop; and that whoever are not with the bishop, are not in the Church; that is, none who voluntarily withdraw from his communion, and set up others in oppositio to it. To the same purpose he says again,^o that the ordination of bishops, and the constitution of the Church, came down by succession from the apostles, so as that the Church stood upon its bishops, and every act of the Church was regulated by their direction, as the chief government of it. And, therefore, when some lapsers wrote to him, giving

^a Cyprian. Epist. lxi. p. 168, (lxvi. p. 286, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Christo sunt ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata, et pastori suo grex adhærens. Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse, et ecclesiam in episcopo: et si qui cum episcopo non sint, in ecclesia non esse; et frustra sibi blandiri eos, qui pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt, et latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt; quando ecclesia quæ Catholica una est, scissa non sit, neque divisa; sed sit utique connexa, et cohærentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutino copulata.

^o Ibid. xxxiii. ad Lapsos, (p. 216, edit. cit. 1700.) Per temporum et successionum vices, episcoporum ordinatio, et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super episcopos constitutur: et omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur. . . . Quum hoc divina lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse, ut ecclesiæ nomine literas facerent, quando ecclesia in episcopo et clero et in omnibus stantibus sit constituta. Absit enim, ne Domini misericordia et potestas ejus invidiam patiatur, et ecclesia esse dicatur lapsorum numerus; quum scriptum sit, ‘Deus non est mortuorum, sed vivorum.’ (Oxon. 1682, p. 66.)

themselves the name of the Church, he gave them a very sharp answer, telling them, he could not but wonder at their temerity and boldness, that they should style themselves the Church, when it was so plain, by the Divine law, that a Church consisted of a bishop and clergy, together with a people, standing firm, without lapsing, in time of persecution; whereas no number of lapsers could be called a Church, since God was not the God of the dead, but of the living. In another place, he severely rebukes the presumption of those presbyters, who took upon them, by their own authority, to reconcile lapsers without consulting him, who was the chief manager and director of the discipline of the Church. This, he tells them,^p was to forget both the rules of the Gospel, and their own station; neither thinking of the future judgment of the Lord, nor the bishop that was now set over them; but assuming to themselves the whole power of discipline, both to the dishonour and contempt of their bishop, and to the detriment of their brethren's salvation. It was an ancient rule in the Church, that presbyters should do no ministerial act but by the authority of their bishop, and in dependence upon and subordination to him. This I have had occasion to shew at large in a former Book, out of Ignatius, Cyprian, and the ancient Councils,^q which need not here be repeated. Therefore it was always reputed a tendency toward schism, for presbyters to do any such act in contempt of their bishop, though they made no formal separation from him. But the most flagrant act of schism was, when, in despite of his authority, their factious humour and pride pushed them on to divide from his communion, and set up separate assemblies in opposition to him. "This," says St. Cyprian, "is the first beginning of heretics, the first rise and attempt of schismatics, men of evil dispo-

^p Cyprian. Epist. x. al. xvi. ad Clerum, p. 36, (p. 194, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Quod non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini, quando aliqui de presbyteris, nec evangelii nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini iudicium neque nunc sibi præpositum episcopum cogitantes, quod numquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia et contentu præpositi totum sibi vindicent? atque utinam non contra fratrum nostrorum salutem sibi omnia vindicarent.

^q Book ii. chap. iii. sect. ii.

sitions, to please themselves, and with a swelling pride condemn the bishop that is set over them. The effect of which is, presently to forsake the Church, and set up another profane altar without, and to rebel against the peace of Christ, and the ordination and unity of God." "Most heresies and schisms take their birth," says he again,^r "from this original,^s that men refuse to submit to the bishop appointed by God; and consider not that there ought to be but one bishop at once in a Church, and but one judge in the room of Christ." This he speaks particularly against those who thought to justify their schism by setting up an anti-bishop in opposition to the true one: which did not diminish the schism, but heighten and augment it, and commonly render it more inveterate and lasting. As it was in the case of the Meletians in Egypt, and the Donatists in Africa, and the Novatians at Rome, who all carried on their schisms more powerfully by the help of anti-bishops to strengthen their party, and uphold their faction. But this was no just pretence for schism, but a manifest violation of the standing rule of the Catholic Church, which was, to have but one bishop in a Church, as the centre of unity: and to set up another in opposition to him, was not to make another true bishop or pastor of the flock, to whom the people were obliged to join themselves as the minister of God, but to introduce a wolf, an adulterer, a sacrilegious usurper, a stranger, and an alien, from whom they were obliged to fly, as from one who had no title to their obedience by any Divine appointment, or allowed rule of ordination. I have more than once more fully demonstrated this out of the writings of Cyprian,^t and others of the ancients, to which it

^r Cyprian. Epist. lv. al. iii. ad Rogatian. p. 6, (p. 173, edit. Amstelod.) *Hæc sunt initia hæreticorum, et ortus atque conatus schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant, et præpositum superbo tumore contemnunt. Sic de ecclesia receditur; sic altare profanum foris collocatur; sic contra pacem Christi et ordinationem atque unitatem Dei rebellatur.*

^s Ibid. Epist. lv. al. lix. ad Cornel. p. 129, (p. 261, edit. cit.) *Neque aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos, et ad tempus iudex vice Christi cogitatur.*

^t Book ii. chap. xiii. sect. i. See also Scholastic History of Lay-Baptism, part ii. chap. ii.

is here sufficient to refer the reader. I only note one thing out of Cyprian, which he applies particularly to the case of the Novatian schism, that to set up such an anti-bishop to head a faction," was to act against the settlement of the Church, the laws of the Gospel, and the unity of the Catholic institution: it was to make another Church, to tear the members of Christ, and disjoint that one body and soul of the Lord's flock by a dividing emulation. And, therefore, he tells Maximus, and Nicostratus, and other confessors, who were concerned in upholding and abetting the Novatian schism, that they were not asserting the Gospel of Christ, whilst they divided themselves from the flock of Christ, and were not in peace and concord with his Church. It is usual with him, upon this account, to say, "He has not God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother."^u Whoever is separated from the Church, to be joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the Church: he cannot come to the rewards of Christ, who leaves the Church of Christ: he is an alien, he is profane, he is an enemy: and that martyrdom itself, which was accounted in many cases equivalent to baptism, would not expiate this crime, unless the offended party returned to the unity of the Church. "For what peace," says he,^v "can they promise themselves,

^u Cyprian. Epist. xlv. al. xlv. (89), ad Maxim. et Nicostrat. Confessores, (p. 232, edit. Amstelod.) Gravatus me atque contristatus, et intolerabilis percussus et pene prostratus pectoris mœstitia perstringit; quum vos illic comperissem contra ecclesiasticam dispositionem, contra evangelicam legem, contra institutionis Catholicæ unitatem, alium episcopum fieri consensisse, id est, quod nec fas est, nec licet fieri, ecclesiam aliam constitui; Christi membra discerpi, Dominici gregis animum et corpus unum, discissa æmulatione lacerari . . . Nec putetis sic vos evangelium Christi asserere, dum vosmet ipsos a Christi grege et ab ejus pace et concordia separatis.

^x Ibid. de Unit. Eccles. p. 109, (p. 78, edit. cit.) Quisquis, ab ecclesia segregatus, adulteræ jungitur, a promissis ecclesiæ separatur. Nec pervenit ad Christi præmia, qui relinquit ecclesiam Christi. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est. Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem.

^y Ibid. p. 113, (pp. 81, 82, edit. cit.) Quam sibi pacem promittunt inimici fratrum? Quæ sacrificia celebrare se credunt æmuli sacerdotum? an secum esse Christum, quum collecti fuerint, opinantur qui extra Christi ecclesiam colliguntur? Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur. Inexpiabilis et gravis culpa discordiæ nec passione

who die in enmity with their brethren? What sort of sacrifices do they think they offer, who rival the priests with emulation? Do they imagine Christ is with them, when they are assembled, who assemble out of the Church of Christ? Such men, though they be slain for the confession of his name, do not wash away the stain with their blood. The inextinguishable and grievous crime of dissension is not purged away by their passion: he cannot be a martyr, that is not in the Church: he cannot attain to the kingdom, who deserts the Church which is to have the kingdom. Christ commended peace to us; he commanded us to be unanimous and united together in concord; he enjoined us to keep the bonds of love and charity firm and inviolable. He cannot make himself a martyr, that retains not brotherly charity. St. Paul teaches us this, and testifies, saying, 'Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burnt, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; doth not behave itself unseemly, is not puffed up, is not easily

purgatur. Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est: ad regnum non pervenire poterit, qui eam, quæ regnatura est, derelinquit. Pacem nobis Christus dedit: concordēs atque unanimes esse præcepit: dilectionis et caritatis fœdera incorrupta atque inviolata servari mandavit: exhibere se non potest martyrem, qui fraternam non tenuit caritatem. Docet hoc et testatur Paulus apostolus, dicens, 'Et si habuero fidem, ita ut montes transferam, caritatem autem non habeam, nihil sum. Et si in cibos pauperum distribuero omnia mea, et si tradidero corpus meum ut ardeam, caritatem autem non habeam, nihil proficio. Caritas magnanima est, caritas benigna est, caritas non æmulator, non agit perperam, non inflatur, non irritatur, non cogitat malum. Omnia diligit, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet: caritas numquam excidit.' 'Numquam,' inquit, 'excidit caritas:' hæc enim semper in regno erit: hæc in æternum fraternitatis sibi coherentis unitate durabit. Ad regnum cœlorum non potest pervenire discordia; nec præmium Christi, qui dixit, 'Hoc est mandatum meum, ut diligatis invicem, quemadmodum dilexi vos.' Pertinere non poterit ad Christum, qui dilectionem Christi perfida dissensione violavit. Qui caritatem non habet, Deum non habet. Joannis beati apostoli vox est, 'Deus,' inquit, 'dilectio est; et qui manet in dilectione, in Deo manet, et Deus in illo manet.' Cum Deo manere non possunt, qui esse in ecclesia Dei unanimes noluerunt; ardeant licet flammis et ignibus traditi, vel objecti bestiis animas suas ponant; non erit illa fidei corona, sed pœna perfidiæ; nec religiosæ virtutis exitus gloriosus, sed desperationis interitus.

provoked, thinketh no evil, loveth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Charity never faileth: it will always be in possession of the kingdom; it will endure for ever in the unity of that fraternity which adheres together. But discord cannot attain to the kingdom of heaven, nor come to the reward of Christ, who said, 'This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you.' He cannot appertain to Christ, who violates the love of Christ by perfidious dissension. He that hath not love, hath not God. It is the voice of the blessed apostle St. John: 'God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.' They cannot dwell with God, who would not abide unanimously in the Church of God: though they burn in the flames, though they be cast into the fire, or thrown to wild beasts, and so lay down their lives, that will not be the crown of their faith, but the punishment of their perfidiousness; not the glorious exit of a religious virtue, but a death of desperation. 'Such a one may be slain, but he cannot be crowned: *Occidi talis potest, coronari non potest.*' Cyprian often repeats this assertion in other places of his writings (which for brevity's sake I omit), and particularly applies it to the schism of the Novatians, who brake the unity of the Church by setting up Novatian, their leader, as anti-bishop, against Cornelius, the lawful bishop of Rome; who being once regularly chosen and invested in his office, no other could intrude himself into the same place without dividing the unity of the Church. Which was not the singular opinion of St. Cyprian, but the voice of the whole Catholic Church, as I have had occasion to demonstrate more fully in another discourse,^a to which I refer the reader for greater satisfaction. Neither was it any private opinion of Cyprian, that a schismatic, continuing a schismatic without repentance, could not be a martyr; but herein he is followed by the greatest lights of the Church, St. Chrysostom,^a St.

^a Scholastic History of Lay-Baptism, part ii. chap. ii. sect. iv.

^a Chrysostom. Hom. xi. in Ephes. p. 957, edit. Francof. 1697. 'Ἀνὲρ δὲ τις ἄγιος εἰπὶ σὶ δοκοῦν εἶναι σολμνηρόν, πλὴν ἄλλ' ὅμως ἰθὺίγχατο· σὶ δὲ τοῦτό ισταν, οὐδὲ μαρτυρίου αἵμα ταύτην δύνασθαι ἐκαλίφειν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἔφησιν. (Paris. 1636, p. 1107.)

Austin,^b Fulgentius,^c and others, who cite this saying of his with approbation. Which shews what weight they laid upon this sort of unity of submission and obedience to every lawful bishop, in the regular management of the affairs of his own Church.

But we must note, that this obedience was only due to bishops, when they could make out a just title to it by the standing rules of the Catholic Church. For, first, if any man came into his office by a simoniacal ordination, his ordination, by the canons, was declared null and void :^d and then no obedience was due to him, nor any communion to be held with him, as a bishop of the Church. 2. If a man intruded himself into a full see, where another bishop was regularly ordained before him, it was so far from being a

^b Aug. ep. lxi. (vol. ii. p. 582, F.) Nescio quoties disputando et scribendo monstravimus, non eos posse habere martyrum mortem, quia Christianorum non habent vitam, quum martyrem non faciat pœna, sed causa.—Ep. cciv. (vol. ii. p. 467, B. C.) Foris ab ecclesia constitutus, et separatus a communione unitatis et vinculo caritatis, æterno supplicio punieris, etiamsi pro Christi nomine vivus incendereris.

^c Fulgent. de Fide ad Petr. c. iii. (inter opp. Aug. tom. iii. p. 225, d. edit. Basil. 1569.) Ideo debet ad ecclesiam redire, non ut sacramentum baptismatis iterum accipiat, quod nemo debet in quolibet homine baptizato repetere : sed ut in Catholica societate vitam æternam accipiat, ad quam obtinendam numquam potest esse idoneus, qui cum sacramento baptismatis ab ecclesia Catholica remanserit alienus. Qui si eleemosynas largas faciat, et pro nomine Christi etiam sanguinem fundat, pro eo, quod in hac vita non tenuit ecclesiæ Catholicæ unitatem, non habebit æternam salutem. (Paris. 1661, p. 492.)—Cap. xxxix. Firmissime tene, et nullatenus dubites, quemlibet hæreticum sive schismaticum in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti baptizatum, si ecclesiæ Catholicæ non fuerit aggregatus, quantascumque eleemosynas fecerit, et si pro Christi nomine etiam sanguinem fuderit, nullatenus posse salvari. Omni enim homini, qui ecclesiæ Catholicæ non tenet unitatem, neque baptismus, neque eleemosyna quamlibet copiosa, neque mors pro nomine Christi suscepta proficere poterit ad salutem, quamdiu in eo hæretica vel schismatica pravitas perseverat, quæ ducit ad mortem. (P. 497.)

^d Can. Apost. c. [xxviii.] xxx. Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος διὰ χρημάτων τῆς ἀξίας ταύτης ἰγκρατὴς γίνηται, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρέσθω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας, καὶ ἡ κοσμήσας παντάπασι καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας, ὡς Σίμων ὁ Μάγος ὅς ἐμou Πίτρου. —Conc. Chalced. c. ii. (tom. iv. Conc. p. 755.) Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ χρήμασι χειροτονίας ποιήσας, καὶ εἰς πρᾶσιν καταγάγῃ τὴν ἄπρατον χάριν, καὶ χειροτονήσῃ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ ὑποεπίσκοπον, ἢ πρεσβύτερον, ἢ διάκονον, ἢ ἑτέρον τινα τῶν ἐν τῇ κλήρῳ καταριθμουμένων, ἢ προβάλλοιτο ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἢ οἰκονόμος, ἢ ἑκδικὸν, ἢ προσμονάριον, ἢ ὅλως τινὰ τοῦ κανόνος, δι' αἰσχροπύρδιαν οἰκίαν· ὁ τοῦτο ἐπιχειρήσας, ἐπιγυθίς, περὶ τὸν οἰκίον κινδυνεύει βαθμὸν καὶ ὁ χειροτονούμενος μηδὲν ἐκ τῆς κατ' ἐμπορίαν ὠφελίσθω χειροτονίας ἢ προβολῆς, ἀλλ' ἔστω ἀλλοτρίος τῆς ἀξίας, ἢ τοῦ φροντισματος, οὕτως ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἔτιχεν.

duty to pay obedience to him, that it was the very crime of schism we have now been speaking of in the Novatians of old, to separate from the true bishop by joining with an invader set up against him. 3. If a bishop fell into manifest heresy or idolatry, the people were not only at liberty, but obliged, in point of duty, to separate from his communion, as an intolerable prevaricator and transgressor. Thus Cyprian* tells the people of Leon and Astorga, in Spain, with relation to Martialis and Basilides, two bishops that fell into idolatry, that it was their duty, in obedience to the Divine commands, to separate themselves from such apostatizing bishops, and not join in their sacrilegious sacrifices; forasmuch as it was chiefly in their power either to choose worthy bishops, or refuse the unworthy. And the same obligation lay upon them to separate from the communion of a heretical bishop, as is evident from the whole practice of the Church. 4. If any bishops were legally deposed for any other misdemeanours, it was equally the people's duty to give vigour and effect to the censures of the Church by deserting their communion, and adhering to such as were by just authority substituted in their room. 5. It sometimes happened, that the dispute of right between two contending bishops was so nice, and doubtful, and hard to be determined, that good and wise men might join with either, till the matter of dispute was fully ended by a competent authority, from which there lay no further appeal. This was like the case of a *lite pendente*, where each party might be presumed to have a right, till the cause was fully heard and adjusted: and in such a case it would be hard to condemn innocent men who joined with either side, till some better light and direction could be afforded them, which might give a final determination of the question in debate, and settle more perfectly the rule of communion. This was the case between Flavian and Evagrius, bishops of Antioch. Flavian was generally received in the Eastern Churches; but Evagrius

* Cyprian. Ep. lxxviii. al. lxxvii. p. 171, (p. 288, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis, et Deum metuens, a peccatore præposito separare se debet; nec se ad sacrilegi sacerdotis sacrificia miscere; quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi.

had the countenance of the bishops of Rome, and the Western Churches; and, during this contention, it was no great crime in men of honest minds to join with either party, since the matter was so hard to be determined by the greatest authority in the Church. 6. Sometimes a bishop, who might be presumed to have a right in a Church, was willing to resign to his opposite, to prevent a schism, and preserve the peace of the Church: and, in that case, there could be no harm in submitting to the opposite, because it was done by consent and cession of the true bishop, and was confirmed by the approbation of the Church. 7. Sometimes a bishop was willing to resign for the sake of peace, but a superior power would not permit him so to do. Thus Flavian, in the forementioned dispute with Evagrius, being summoned by the Emperor Theodosius to have his cause heard and decided at Rome, generously told the emperor, "That if his faith was accused as erroneous, or his life as immoral, and unqualifying him for a bishoprick, he would freely let his accusers be his judges, and stand to their determination, whatever it were. But, if the dispute be only about the throne and government of the Church," said he, "I shall not stay for judgment, nor contend with any that has a mind to that, but freely recede, and abdicate the throne of my own accord; and you, great sir, may commit the see of Antioch to whom you please." The historian says,^f "The emperor was so much affected with this generous answer, that, instead of sending him to Rome for judgment, he sent him back to take care of his Church, and would never after hearken to any solicitations that were made to expel him." Now, in this case, it were unreasonable to think, that the people which followed Flavian, among whom was St. Chrysostom, were in any fault, though the judgment

^f Theodoret. lib. v. c. xxiii. (Vales. Amst. 1695, p. 230, C.) Εἰ μὲν τῆς πίστεως, ὃ βασιλεὺς, τῆς ἰμῆς ὡς οὐκ ὀρθῆς κατηγοροῦσί τινες, ἢ τὸν βίον φασὶν ἱερωσύνης ἀνάξιον, καὶ αὐτοῖς χρήσομαι τοῖς πατηγόροις κριταῖς, καὶ τὴν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐκφορμὴν ψῆφον δέξομαι. εἰ δὲ περὶ θρόνου καὶ προεδρίας ζυγομαχοῦσιν, οὐτε δικάσομαι, οὐτε τοῖς λαβὼν βουλομένοις ἀντιμαχίσομαι· ἀλλ' ἐκστήσομαι καὶ τῆς προεδρίας ἀρίζημα· τοιγάρτοι δὲς ὃ βούλει τὸν Ἀντιοχείων θρόνον, ὃ βασιλεὺς ταύτην αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀνδρίαν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν θαυμάσας, τὴν ἐντολὴν καταλαβὼν καὶ τὴν ἐγκλησιθῆσαν πομαίνειν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκίλιωσι.

of the Western bishops was against him. 8. Lastly, sometimes two bishops were allowed to sit jointly in the same see, as some suppose Peter and Paul to have been at Rome; the one, the bishop of the Jews; and the other, of the Gentiles; or, when one was to be coadjutor to the other; or, when it was to cure an inveterate schism, as it was in the proposal made by the Catholic bishops to the Donatists in the collation of Carthage: of all which cases the reader may find an exact account given in a former part of this work.^s Now, in such cases, obedience might be paid to either bishop without schism, because there was no opposition between them: and though it was not according to the common rule of the Church to have two bishops ordinarily sitting together in one see at the same time, yet for extraordinary reasons this was sometimes allowed in special cases: and then there was no schism or other evil in it, no breach of unity or encroachment upon any man's right, because it was done for expedience and benefit of the community, by common consent of all parties, and the general approbation of the Church. I have interposed these cautions, that it might be more particularly understood, wherein the due submission to every bishop in his own Church consisted; and under what limitations obedience was required to a single bishop, regularly appointed, to preserve the unity of the Church.

SECT. VII. — *Fourthly, The Unity of Submission to the Discipline of the Church.*

4. To preserve the unity of the Church in its well-being, it was required that every member of a Church should submit to the ordinary rules of discipline appointed for the punishment of delinquents: and neither despise the lawful censures of his own Church; nor seek clandestinely to be restored to communion in any other Church, without giving satisfaction to his own Church, whereof he was a member; nor betake himself to the conventicles of heretics or schismatics, to be received by them as a communicant, when he was cast out of his own Church as a criminal. For all these were direct violations of the unity of discipline, which ought to be pre-

^s Book ii. chap. xiii.

served entire in every Church. The effect of a legal excommunication, and the power of the keys, was always reputed such, as that if a man was justly cast out of the communion of his own Church for his offences, he was supposed to be excluded from all title to the kingdom of heaven, during his continuance in that state, by virtue of our Saviour's authority delegated to the Church, in those words, "Whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained:" and, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven." And, therefore, unless men submitted to the ordinary way of restoring offenders, and sought to be reconciled to the peace of the Church by the proper methods of public confession and repentance, and intercession for pardon and absolution, they were treated as despisers of the Church's discipline; and if they died in that state, without being first reconciled, and received into communion again, they were looked upon as persons in a deplorable condition, as dying in a state of sin and rebellion against God, and out of the unity of the Church. For which reason, no solemnity was ever used at their funeral, as was usual for those who died in the peace of the Church; nor were their oblations received, or any offerings or commemorations made for them, as for others, in the usual service of the Church. Only in one case a little favour was shewed to such as died in the bonds of excommunication, unrelaxed by any formal absolution: which was, when such penitents as obediently submitted to the Church's discipline, and gave evident tokens of their sincere repentance, happened to die suddenly, when they were desirous of reconciliation and absolution, but, by unavoidable necessity, could not have it. In this case, the canons ordered, "That their oblations should be received, as a testimony of their submission, and being united in heart and mind to the Church, though they could not have the formality of an external absolution." In the fourth Council of Carthage, there is a canon to this purpose:^h "Such penitents as are intent and diligent in observing the rules of penance, if they

^h Conc. Carth. IV. c. lxxix. *Pœnitentes, qui attente leges pœnitentiæ exsequuntur, si casu in itinere vel in mari mortui fuerint, ubi eis subveniri non possit, memoria eorum et orationibus et oblationibus commendetur.* (Labb. ii. p. 1206.)

chance to die in a journey, or at sea, where they can have no help or remedy, shall, notwithstanding, have their memory commended both in the prayers and oblations of the Church." The second Council of Vaison is a little more particular in declaring how such penitents shall be admitted to all the privileges of Church-communion after death :ⁱ " If any of those who are under penance, and live in the course of a good life with satisfactory compunction, happen to die suddenly and unexpectedly, either in the country or in a journey, their oblations shall be received, and their funeral obsequies and memorials shall be celebrated in the usual manner and affection of the Church : because it were unjust that their commemorations should be excluded from the salutary mysteries, who, whilst they were labouring earnestly, with a faithful affection, after those holy mysteries, were intercepted, by sudden death, from the *viaticum* of the sacraments, to whom the priest, perhaps, would have thought fit to have granted the most absolute reconciliation." There are a great many canons in the second Council of Arles,^k and the second of Orleans, and the second of Toledo, and the Council of Epone, to the same purpose. By all which we may judge, that though the Church was severe against impenitent apostates, and contemners of her discipline, yet she shewed great favour and tenderness toward such as

ⁱ Conc. Vasens. II. c. ii. vol. iii. p. 1457. Pro his, qui pœnitentia accepta, in bonæ vitæ cursu satisfactoria compunctione viventes, sine communione inopinato nonnumquam transitu, in agris aut itineribus præveniuntur, oblationem recipendam, et eorum funera, ac deinceps memoriam ecclesiastico adfectu proseguendam; quia nefas est eorum commemoraciones excludi a salutaribus sacris, qui ad eadem sacra fidei adfectu contententes, dum se diutius reos statuunt, indignos salutiferis mysteriis judicant, ac dum purgatiores restitui desiderant, absque sacramentorum viatico intercipiuntur: quibus fortasse nec absolutissimam reconciliationem sacerdos denegandam putasset.

^k Conc. Arelat. II. c. xii. De his, qui in pœnitentia positi vita excesserunt, placuit nullum communione vacuum debere dimitti; sed pro eo, quod honoravit pœnitentiam, oblatio ipsius suscipiatur. — Conc. Aurel. II. c. xiv. — Conc. Tolet. II. c. xii. — Conc. Epaon. c. xxxvi. Ne ullus sine remedio aut spe veniæ ab ecclesia repellatur, neve ulli, si aut pœnituerit, aut se correxerit, ad veniam redeundi aditus obstruatur. Sed si cui forsitan discrimen mortis immineat, damnationis constituta tempora relaxentur. Quod si ægrotum accepto viatico revallescere fortasse contingit, statuti temporis spatia observare conveniet. (Labb. vol. iv. p. 1580.)

really honoured her discipline, and gave evident tokens of repentance: such men were not deemed to depart out of the unity and communion of the Church, though they happened to die without the formality of an external absolution; being internally reconciled both to God and the Church, by the testimonies of repentance, in such cases of extremity, where not their own will, but the necessity of their circumstances, precluded them from a more formal reconciliation.

SECT. VIII.—*How different Churches maintained the Communion with one another. First, in Faith.*

And thus far we have considered the unity of every Church with relation to its own members: we are next to examine, what communion different Churches held with one another, that we may discover the harmonious unity of the Catholic Church. And here, first of all, we are to observe, that as there was one common faith, consisting of certain fundamental articles, essential to the very being of a particular Church, and its unity, and the being of a Christian; so this same faith was necessary to unite the different parts of the Catholic Church, and make them one body of Christians. So that if any Church deserted or destroyed this faith in whole or in part, they were looked upon as rebels and traitors against Christ, and enemies to the common faith, and treated as a conventicle of heretics, and not of Christians. Upon this account, every bishop not only made a declaration of his faith at his ordination, before the provincial synod that ordained him, but also sent his circular or ‘encyclical letters,’ as they were called, to foreign Churches, to signify that he was in communion with them. And this was so necessary a thing in a bishop newly ordained, that Liberatus tells us,¹

¹ Liberat. Breviar. c. xvii. (tom. v. Conc. p. 766.) Ordinator a communicatoribus ejus episcopis et clericis et monachis, qui ejus noverant fidem et gubernationem, Joannes ex œconomo, cognomento Talaia. . . . Joannes Talaia de ordinatione sua neglexit per suas synodicas litteras Acacio, episcopo Constantinopolitano, destinare. . . . Posthæc Acacius audiens de ordinatione Joannis, et contristatus, quia synodicas epistolas non direxisset, et una faciens cura Gennadio episcopo, parente beati Timothei, volentes ei nocere, &c. . . . Nec tamen prius hoc faceret, nisi susciperet henoticon principis, et synodicas destinaret epistolas Constantinopolitano Acacio, et Simplicio Romano, et ceteris archiepiscopis, &c.

the omission of it was interpreted a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world, and a virtual charge of heresy upon himself or them.

SECT. IX.— *Secondly, In mutual Assistance of each other, for Defence of the common Faith.*

2. To maintain this unity of faith entire, every Church was ready to give each other their mutual assistance, to oppose all fundamental errors, and beat down heresy at its first appearance among them. The whole world, in this respect, was but one common diocess, the episcopate was a universal thing, and every bishop had his share in it in such a manner as to have an equal concern in the whole: as I have more fully shewed in another place,^m where I observed, that in things not appertaining to the faith, bishops were not to meddle with other men's diocesses, but only to mind the business of their own; but when the faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule of there being but one episcopacy, every other bishoprick was as much their diocess as their own; and no human laws or canons could tie up their hands from performing such acts of the episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of faith and religion. This was the ground of their meeting in synods, provincial, national, and general, and sending their joint opinions and advice from one Church to another. The greatest part of church-history is made up of such acts as these, so that it were next to impertinent to refer to any particulars. I only observe one thing further upon this head, that the intermeddling with other men's concerns, which would have been accounted a real breach of unity in many other cases, was in this case thought so necessary, that there was no certain way to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church and faith without it. And, as an instance of this, I have noted in the forecited Book, that though it was against the ordinary rule of the Church for any bishop to ordain in another man's diocess; yet, in case a bishop turned heretic, and persecuted the orthodox, and would ordain none but

^m Book ii. chap. v. sect. ii.

heretical men to establish heresy in his diocese ; in that case, any orthodox bishop was not only authorized, but obliged, as opportunity served, and the needs of the Church required, to ordain Catholic teachers in such a diocese, to oppose the malignant designs of the enemy, and stop the growth of heresy, which might otherwise take deep root, and spread and overrun the Church. Thus Athanasius, and the famous Eusebius of Samosata, went about the world in the prevalence of the Arian heresy, ordaining, in every Church where they came, such clergy as were necessary to support the orthodox cause in such a time of distress and desolation : and this was so far from being reckoned a breach of the Church's unity, though against the letter of a canon in ordinary cases, that it was necessary to be done, in such a state of affairs, to maintain the unity of the Catholic faith, which every bishop was obliged to defend, not only in his own diocese, but in all parts of the world, by virtue of that rule which obliges bishops, in weighty affairs, to take care of the Catholic Church ; and requires all Churches, in time of danger, to give mutual aid and assistance to one another.

SECT. X.—*Thirdly, In joining in Communion with each other in all Holy Offices, as occasion required.*

3. This unity of the Catholic Church was further maintained by the readiness of each Church, and every member of it, to join in communion with all other Churches in the performance of Divine worship, and all holy offices, as their occasions required. To this purpose two things were necessary. 1st. That every Church should keep her liturgy free from all superstitious and idolatrous worship, and not render her assemblies for holy duties inaccessible, by entrenching upon any Divine rule, or making any unlawful conditions of communion. And how careful the ancient Church was in this point, may be seen by any one that will peruse the account I have lately given of the liturgy of the ancient Churches in all the several parts of it ;^a where none of those superstitious and idolatrous practices appear, that have so much divided the Church in later ages, since the

^a Book xiii.

exorbitant power of the Romish Church imposed so much upon the credulity of men in points of faith, and loaded their consciences so heavily in matters of unwarrantable practice. 2d. It was necessary that every Christian, when he came to a foreign Church, should readily comply with the innocent usages and customs of that Church where he happened to be, though they might chance, in some circumstances, to differ from his own. This was a necessary rule of peace, to preserve the unity of communion and worship throughout the whole Catholic Church: for it was impossible that every Church should have the same rites and ceremonies, the same customs and usages, in all respects, or even the same method and manner of worship, exactly agreeing in all punctilios with one another, unless there had been a general liturgy for the whole Church expressly enjoined by Divine appointment. The unity of the Catholic Church did not require this (as we shall see more plainly by and by); and, therefore, no one ever insisted upon this as any necessary part of its unity. It was enough that all Churches agreed in the substance of Divine worship; and for circumstances, such as rites and ceremonies, method and order, and the like, every Church had liberty to judge and choose for herself by the rules of expediency and convenience: and then, as it was the duty of every member of any particular Church to comply with the innocent customs of his own Church, in order to hold free communion with her; so it was the duty of every Christian to comply with the different customs of all other Churches wherever he happened to travel, in order to hold communion with the Catholic Church in all places, without exception. This rule is often inculcated by St. Austin, as the great rule of peace and unity with regard to all Churches: and, he tells us, he received it as an oracle from the wise and moderate discourses of St. Ambrose, whom he consulted upon the occasion of a scruple, which had possessed the heart of his mother, Monnica, and for some time greatly perplexed her. She, having lived a long time at Rome, was used to fast on Saturday or the Sabbath, according to the custom of the Church of Rome; but, when she came to Milan, she found the contrary custom

prevailing, which was to keep Saturday a festival: and, being much disturbed about this, her son, though he had not much concern about such matters at that time, for her ease and satisfaction consulted St. Ambrose upon the point, to take his advice and direction how to govern herself in this case, so as to be inoffensive in her practice. To whom St. Ambrose answered, "That he could give no better advice in the case than to do as he himself was wont to do: for," said he,^o "when I am here, I do not fast on the Sabbath; when I am at Rome, I fast on the Sabbath: and so you, whatever Church you come to, observe the custom of that Church, if you neither take offence at them, nor give offence to them." St. Austin says,^p "This answer satisfied his mother, and he always looked upon it as an oracle sent from heaven." He adds, moreover, "That he had often experienced with grief and sorrow the disturbance of weak minds, occasioned either by the contentious obstinacy of certain brethren, or by their own superstitious fears, who, in matters of this nature, which can neither be certainly determined by the authority of Holy Scripture, nor by the tradition of the Universal Church, nor by any advantage in the correction of life, raise such litigious questions, as to think nothing right but what themselves do; only because they were used to do so in their own country; or because a little shallow reason tells them it ought to be so; or because they have, perhaps, seen some such thing in their travels, which they reckon the more learned, the more remote it is from their own country." Thus he handsomely and elegantly reflects upon the superstitious folly and contentious obstinacy of such as disturbed the Church's peace for such things

^o Aug. Epist. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. See sect. v. note (1).

^p Ibid. Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. tom. iii. opp. p. 557, edit. Basil. (Bened. 1700, vol. ii. p. 94, D.) Sensi sæpe dolens et gemens multas infirmorum perturbationes fieri, per quorumdam fratrum contentiosam obstinationem, vel superstitiosam timiditatem, qui in rebus hujusmodi, quæ neque Scripturæ Sanctæ auctoritate, neque universalis ecclesiæ traditione, neque vitæ corrigendæ utilitate, ad certum possunt terminum pervenire (tantum quia subest qualiscumque ratiocinatio cogitantis, aut quia in sua patria sic ipse consuevit, aut quia ibi vidit, ubi peregrinationem suam, quo remotiorem a suis, eo doctiorem factam putat), tam litigiosas excitant questiones, ut nisi quod ipsi faciunt, nihil rectum existiment.

as every Church had liberty to use, and every good Christian was obliged to comply with. "For," as he says in the same place,^q "all such customs as varied in the practice of different Churches, as, that some fasted on the Saturday, and others did not; some received the eucharist every day, others on the Sabbath and Lord's day, and others on the Lord's day only; and whatever else there was of this kind, they were all things of free observation: and in such things there could be no better rule for a grave and prudent Christian to walk by, than to do as the Church did, wherever he happened to come. For, whatever was enjoined, that was neither against faith nor good manners, was to be held indifferent, and to be observed according to the custom and for the convenience of the society among whom we live." This he repeats over and over again,^r as the most safe rule of practice in all such things, wherein the customs of Churches varied, that wherever we see any things appointed, or know them to be appointed, that are neither against faith nor good manners, and have any tendency to edification, and to stir men up to a good life, we should not only abstain from finding fault with them, but follow them both by our commendation and imitation. By this rule all wise and peaceable men always governed their practice in holding communion with other Churches: though they did not altogether like their customs, they did not break com-

^q Aug. Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. tom. iii. opp. p. 556, edit. Basil. (Bened. 1700, vol. ii. p. 94, A.) Quæ per loca terrarum regiones, ue variantur, sicuti est, quod alii jejunant sabba'o, alii non: alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt: alibi nullus dies prætermittitur, quo non offeratur, alibi sabbato tantum et Dominico, alibi tantum Dominico: et si quid aliud hujusmodi animadverti potest, totum hoc genus rerum libera habet observationes: nec disciplina ulla est in his melior gravi prudentique Christiano, quam ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit ecclesiam, ad quam forte devenerit. Quod enim neque contra fidem, neque contra bonos mores esse convincitur, indifferenter est habendum, et propter eorum, inter quos vivitur, societatem servandum est.

^r Ibid. Epist. cxix. ad Januar. c. xviii. De iis, quæ varie per diversa loca observantur, una in his saluberrima regula retinenda est, ut, quæ non sunt contra fidem, neque contra bonos mores, et habent aliquid ad exhortationem vitæ melioris, ubicumque institui videmus vel instituta cognoscimus, non solum non improbemus, sed etiam laudando et imitando sectemur, si aliquorum infirmitas non ita impedit, ut amplius detrimentum sit. (P. 107, B. 3.)

munion with them upon that account. Thus Irenæus observes to Pope Victor, when he was rashly going to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches for their different way of observing Easter,^s “ That his predecessor, Anicetus, was far from this uncharitable temper. For when Polycarp came to Rome, though they could not come to a perfect agreement in this point, to have all the Churches observe Easter on the same day; yet this difference made no contention between them. For they gave each other the kiss of peace, and communicated together: Anicetus paying Polycarp the customary civility and respect, to let him consecrate the eucharist in his Church.” Irenæus observes further, that though there were many disputes then on foot concerning the time, and length, and manner, of observing the Antepaschal, or Lent fast, yet all Churches agreed to live in peace and union with one another: and the difference of their fasts served only to commend the unity of their faith. And because it was then a customary thing for Churches of different countries to send the eucharist mutually to each other, to testify that they were in communion with one another; he notes it, likewise, as a peculiar instance of the Catholic tempers of the bishops of Rome, Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, Xystus, and Soter, who were Victor’s predecessors in that Church, “ That though they differed from the Asiatic Churches about Easter, yet they lived in peace with them; not only receiving the members of those Churches into communion when they came to Rome, but also sending the eucharist from Rome to those Churches.” Which being so common a way of testifying their communion with distant Churches in those days, it was a very just complaint which Chrysostom made against Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, and his accomplices,^t “ That when they came to Constantinople, they came not to church, according to custom and ancient law; they joined not themselves to him, nor communicated with him in the word or

^s Ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. xxiv. fere tot.

^t Chrysostom. Epist. ad Innocent. tom. iv. p. 677, D. (p. 593, edit. Francof. 1698.) ‘Ο τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ τὴν προεδρίαν ἐγχειρισθὶς Θεόφιλος . . . συναγαγὼν μὲθ’ αὐτοῦ πολλοὺς Αἰγυπτίων ἐπισκόπων οὐκ ὀλίγων παραγίνεσθαι . . . ὥτα τῆς μεγάλης καὶ Θεοφιλοῦς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐκείνης, οὐκ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν

prayer, or the communion of the eucharist; but as soon as they landed, passing by the church, they took their lodging in an inn, when the bishop's house was ready prepared to entertain them." This he complains of as a singular instance of their enmity, faction, and uncharitable spirit, in refusing to communicate with him, before any formal accusation had been brought against him, much less any legal sentence of condemnation pronounced upon him. By this account of things it is easy to judge what stress the ancients laid upon the laws of communion, obliging every Church to communicate with her sister Churches over all the world in all holy offices, in order to preserve the communion of worship one entire thing throughout the whole Catholic Church, without any notorious division or distraction.

SECT. XI. — *Fourthly, In mutual Consent to ratify all legal Acts of Discipline, regularly exercised in any Church whatsoever.*

4. The communion of the whole Catholic Church was further declared by the obligation of such laws, as laid a necessary injunction upon all Churches to ratify all such legal acts of discipline, as were regularly exercised in any Church whatsoever. Thus, if any person was duly baptized, and thereby admitted to be a member of any particular Church, that qualification gave him a right to communicate in any part of the Catholic Church, travelling with commendatory letters from the bishop of his own Church, to signify that he was in perfect and full communion with her, and not cast out for any offence against the rules of her communion. This is what Optatus means, when he says, "That the whole world was united together in one common society, or society of communion, by the mutual commerce

εισήλθε κατὰ τὸ εἶδος, καὶ τὸν ἄνωθεν κρατήσαντα θυσίαν, οὐχ ἡμῖν συνηγίστε, οὐ λόγου μιτιδωκεν, οὐκ εὐχῆς, οὐ κοινωνίας· ἀλλ' ἀποθέας τοῦ πλοίου, καὶ τὰ περίθωρα τῆς ἐκκλησίας παραδραμὼν, ἔξω σου τῆς πόλεως ἀπὸ λῶν ἡλίζετο, καὶ πολλὰ παρακαλίσαντων ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ παραγινόμενους παρ' ἡμῖν κατασχέθηναι· καὶ γὰρ ἅπαντα ἡντρείπιστο, καὶ καταγώγια, καὶ ὅσα εἰνὸς ἦν αὐτὶ ἐκείνοι, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἠνίσχιστο.

Optat. lib. ii. p. 48. Cum quo (socio) nobis totus orbis commercio formatum, in una communionis societate concordat. (Paris. 1631.)

of those canonical or communicatory letters, which they called *formatæ*: because these testifying that he was in the communion of his own Church, by the known laws and rules of discipline, gave him a title to communicate in any other Church whatsoever, only observing the rites and customs of that Church, whither his occasions happened to call him. So, again, if a man was legally excommunicated for his crimes by his own Church, no Church would receive him to communion till he had given proper satisfaction to his own Church, which had bound him by her censures. Such a perfect good understanding and harmony was there, then, among all the parts of the whole Catholic Church, in confirming each other's discipline, and mutually strengthening their authority against all enemies of faith and virtue, whether they were such as tried by open violence and terror, or by secret arts and clandestine practices, to get admission, in opposition to the Church whose censures they lay under. No Church would admit them without communicatory letters: if they were rebels to their own Church, they were accounted rebels to the whole. Thus Epiphanius tells us, "When Marcion, the heretic, was excommunicated by his own father, and desired to be received into communion at Rome, they answered him, 'That they could not do it without the permission of his father: for there was but one faith, and one rule of concord; and they could not do any thing in opposition to their good fellow-servant, and his father.'" This repulse was highly resented by Marcion, and it put him upon those wicked designs of inventing a new heresy to disturb the Church: for he told them directly, in revenge, that he would divide their Church, and bring an eternal schism into it. Which, as Epiphanius rightly observes, was not so much to divide the Church, as to divide

¶ Epiphanius. Hæres. xlii. Marcion. n. ii. (Paris. 1622, vol. i. p. 303, C. 7.) Τί μὴ ἡρέσκασι μοι ὑποδίσκασθαι; τῶν δὲ λεγόντων, ὅτι οὐ δυνάμεθα ἔννευ τῆς πατροῦς τοῦ τιμίου πατρὸς σου τοῦτο ποιῆσαι μία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις. καὶ μία ἡ ἐκκλῆσια, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐναντιωθῆναι τῷ κελῷ συλλειτουργῶν, πατρὶ δὲ σῷ. ζηλώσας λοιπὸν, καὶ εἰς μέγαν ἄρεθις θυμὸν καὶ ὑπερφανίαν, τὸ σχίσμα ἐργάζεται ὁ ταιούτος, ἑαυτῷ τὴν αἵρεσιν προστησάμενος, καὶ εἰπὼν, "Ὅτι ἐγὼ σχίσμα τὴν ἐκκλῆσιαν ἡμῶν, καὶ βαλὼν σχίσμα ἐν αὐτῇ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα" ὡς τάληθ' ἡμῖν σχίσμα ἔβαλεν οὐ μικρὸν, οὐ τὴν ἐκκλῆσιαν σχίσας, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς αὐτῷ πισθόντας.

himself from it. There are a great many other instances of the Church's steadiness and resolution in thus proceeding against delinquents, to maintain the unity of discipline entire in all parts of the ecclesiastical body, and abundance of canons to this purpose; which because I shall have occasion to speak more of hereafter,* I willingly omit them in this place, and go on to observe another instance of the Church's unity in point of practice: which was,

SECT. XII. — *In receiving unanimously the Customs of the Universal Church, and submitting to the Decrees of General Councils.*

5. That all Churches generally agreed in receiving such customs as were handed down, by general consent, from apostolical tradition; or otherwise settled and determined by the decrees of general councils. For by these two ways, many customs became, in a manner, universal, and almost of necessary observance in the Church over all the world: and then for any private man or Church to dispute against them, was to give scandal to the rest of the world, and bring disturbance into the Church, by an unnecessary and unreasonable opposition to things innocent in themselves, and settled by general consent and approbation. St. Austin takes notice of this double source and original of general customs in the Church, for which though there be no express command in Scripture, yet a great deference ought to be paid to the general sentiments, and authority, and practice, and observation of the whole Church. "Those things," says he,† "which we keep, not from Scripture, but from tradition, and which are observed over all the world, are reasonably supposed to have come down to us recommended and appointed either by the apostles themselves, or by some plenary

* Chap. ii. sect. x.

† Aug. Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. Illa, quæ non scripta, sed tradita custodimus, quæ quidem toto terrarum orbe servantur, datur intelligi vel ab ipsis apostolis, vel plenariis conciliis, quorum in ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas, commendata atque statuta retineri, sicuti quod Domini passio, et resurrectio, et adscensio in cælum, et adventus de cælo Spiritus-Sancti, anniversaria solemnitate celebrantur, et si quid aliud tale occurrit, quod servatur ab universa, quacumque se diffundit, ecclesia. (Vol. ii. p. 93, at the bottom.)

councils, whose authority is of great use in the Church; such as the celebrating the anniversary memorial of our Saviour's passion, and resurrection, and ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost from heaven; and whatever else of the like nature is observed by the universal Church in all parts, wherever it spreads itself all the world over." Concerning which sort of things he concludes,^z "That for any man to dispute against them, was most insolent madness, seeing they were authorized by the practice of the universal Church." He particularly applies this rule to the case of observing the Lord's day, not as a fast, but as a festival:^a "For since the whole Church observed it as a festival, no one could turn that day into a fast, without offending God, by giving scandal to the Church universal:" there being both general custom and canon against it.^b For the same reason, it was esteemed a crime to pray kneeling on that day, because the practice of the universal Church was to pray standing,^c in memory of our Saviour's resurrection; and the Council of Nice thought it a thing worthy of a decree to bring all men to a uniformity in that practice. As she did also in the matter of observing the Easter festival, making a rule that all Churches should celebrate it on one and the same day; because it was unlawful, that in a business of so great moment, and the religious observation of such a festival, there should be any dissension, as Constantine expresses it in his epistle which

^a Aug. Epist. cxviii. ad Januar. Si quid horum tota per orbem frequentat ecclesia, quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insolentissimæ insanix est. (P. 95, D. 6.)

^b Ibid. Epist. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. Quis non Deum offendet, si velit cum scandalo totius, quæ ubique dilatatur, ecclesiæ, die Dominico jejunare? (P. 56.)

^c Can. Apost. c. lxiv. [v.] Εἴ τις κληρικὸς ὑβριστῇ τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν ἢ τὸ σάββατον, πλὴν τοῦ ἰνὸς μόνου, νηστύων, καθαιρεῖσθω· ἰὰν δὲ λαϊκὸς ᾖ, ἀφοριεῖσθω. — Conc. Gangren. c. xviii. Εἴ τις διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ νηστύοι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. — Conc. Carth. IV. c. lxiv. Qui Dominico die studiose jejunat, non credatur Catholicus. (ii. 1205.) — Conc. Bracar. I. al. II. c. iv. Si quis natalem Christi secundum carnem non bene honorat, sed honorare se simulat, jejunas in eodem die et in Dominico . . . anathema sit. (Labb. v. 837.)

^d Tertul. de Coron. Milit. c. iii. p. 102, A. Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. — Conc. Nic. c. xx. Ἐπειδὴ εἰσὶ τινες ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ γόνυ κλίνοντες, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραις, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὁμοῦς πάντα ἐν πάσῃ παρακίᾳ ὁμοφρόνως φυλάττεισθαι, ἰστώτας ἰδοῦς τῇ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ τὰς ἐνχρὰς ἀποδιδόναι τῷ Θεῷ. (Labb. ii. 245.)

he sent to all the Churches in the world, upon this occasion.^d So that though several Churches had kept this festival on different days, before this decree was made, yet when it was once past, there was no more liberty for dissension.

SECT. XIII. — *Sixthly, In submitting to the Decrees of National Councils.*

6. The like may be observed of the decrees of national councils, when once the Roman empire was divided into several kingdoms. A great many things were at first allowed to every bishop in the management of his own diocese, which were afterwards restrained by the decrees of national councils. As to instance only in one particular: every bishop anciently had liberty to frame his own liturgy for the use of his own Church: but, in process of time, when the world was divided into several kingdoms, rules were made that all the Churches of such or such a kingdom should have one and the same liturgy. Thus when Spain and Gallia Narbonensis became one distinct kingdom, a decree was made, "That as there was but one faith, so there should be but one liturgy, or order of Divine service, throughout the whole kingdom." The fourth Council of Toledo, under the reign of King Sisenandus, made an express canon to this purpose:^e "After the confession of the true faith, which is preached in the holy Church of God, it seemed good, that all we bishops, who are joined together in the unity of the Catholic faith, should henceforth use no diver-

^d Ap. Euseb. de Vita Constant. lib. iii. c. xviii. (Vales. p. 406, C.) *Πρὸς ταῦτοις κάκεινο πάρεστι συναρῶν, ὡς ἐν τηλικούτῃ πράγματι καὶ ταιαύτῃ Σηρησκίας ἱερτῇ διαφωνίαν ἄρχειν, ἵστιν ἀβήμιτον.*

^e Conc. Tolet. IV. c. ii. Post rectæ fidei confessionem, quæ in sancta Dei ecclesia prædicatur, placuit, ut omnes sacerdotes, qui Catholicæ fidei unitate complectimur, nihil ultra diversum aut dissonum in ecclesiasticis sacramentis agamus; ne quælibet nostra diversitas apud ignotos seu carnales schismatis errorem videatur ostendere, et multis existat in scandalum varietas ecclesiarum. Unus igitur orandi atque psallendi ordo nobis per omnem Hispaniam atque Galliam conservetur: unus modus in missarum solemnitatibus, unus in vespertinis matutinisque officiis: nec diversa sit ultra in nobis ecclesiastica consuetudo, qui in una fide continemur et regno. . . . Hoc et antiqui canones decreverunt, ut unaquæque provincia et psallendi et ministrandi parem consuetudinem contineat. (Labb. v. 1704.)

sity or disagreement in the administration of the ecclesiastical mysteries; lest every such diversity be interpreted a schism among us by carnal men, and such as are unknown to us, and the variety of customs in our Churches become a scandal to many. Let one order, therefore, of prayers and psalmody be observed by us throughout all Spain and Gaul; one manner of celebrating mass [or the communion-service]; and one manner of performing vespers [or evening-service]; and let there henceforth be no diversity in our ecclesiastical customs, seeing we all live in one faith and in one kingdom." That canon also refers to more ancient canons, requiring uniformity in Divine worship throughout provincial churches. And it is most certain, that about this time, that is, in the sixth and seventh centuries, and before, decrees were made in several councils, requiring the Churches of each respective province to conform their usages to the rites and forms of the metropolitical, or principal church, among them. As may be seen in the canons of the Councils of Agde (an. 506),^f and Epone and Girone (an. 517),^g and the Council of Vannes,^h and the first of Braga (an. 465 and 563).ⁱ For

^f Conc. Agath. c. xxx. Quia convenit, ordinem ecclesiæ ab omnibus æqualiter custodiri, studendum est, ut, sicut ubique fit, et post antiphonas collectiones per ordinem ab episcopis vel presbyteris dicantur, et hymni matutini vel vespertini diebus omnibus decantentur, et in conclusione matutinarum vel vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos capitella de psalmis dicantur, et plebs collecta oratione ad vesperam ab episcopo cum benedictione dimittatur. (Labb. iv. 1388.)

^g Conc. Epaon. c. xxvii. Ad celebranda divina officia ordinem, quem metropolitani tenent, provinciales eorum observare debebunt. (Labb. iv. 1579.) — Conc. Gerundens. c. i. De institutione missarum, ut, quomodo in metropolitana ecclesia fuerit, ita Dei nomine in omni Tarraconensi provincia, tam ipsius missæ ordo, quam psallendi, vel ministrandi consuetudo servetur. (Labb. iv. 1568.)

^h Conc. Venet. c. xv. Rectum quoque duximus, ut vel intra provinciam nostram sacrorum ordo et psallendi una sit consuetudo: et sicut unam cum Trinitatis confessione fidem tenemus, unam et officiorum regulam teneamus: ne variata observatione in aliquo devotio nostra discrepare credatur. (Labb. iv. 1057.)

ⁱ Conc. Bracar. I. cc. xix.-xxiii. (Labb. v. p. 840.) Placuit omnibus communi consensu, ut unus atque idem psallendi ordo in matutinis vel vespertinis officiis teneatur. . . . Item placuit, ut per solemnum dierum vigilas vel missas, omnes easdem et non diversas lectiones in ecclesia legant. Item placuit, ut non aliter episcopi et aliter presbyteri populum, sed uno modo salutent, dicentes, ' Dominus sit vobiscum,' &c. Item placuit, ut eodem ordine missæ celebrentur ab omnibus, quem Profuturus quondam hujus metropolitane ecclesiæ episcopus ab ipsa apostolicæ sedis auctoritate suscepit scriptum. Item placuit, ut nullus eum baptizandi ordinem prætermittat, quem et antea tenuit metropolitana Bracaraensis ecclesia.

though, by the most ancient rules, every bishop had liberty to prescribe what he thought proper for his own Church; and no Church pretended to dictate magisterially in such things to any other; yet when Churches became subject to one political head, and national Churches arose from that distinction, then it was thought convenient, by all the bishops of such a nation, to unite more closely in rituals and circumstantials of Divine worship, as well as faith and substantial: and from that time this also became a necessary part of the union of national Churches; in which all the bishops voluntarily combining, no one could depart from that unity, without incurring the guilt of an unnecessary breach of that union, which was so convenient for cementing the several members of a national Church into one communion.

SECT. XIV.—*No Necessity of a Visible Head to unite all the Parts of the Catholic Church into one Communion.*

Thus we have seen wherein the unity of the Catholic Church, considered in its utmost latitude, consisted. And hence one might safely infer these two things negatively, without any further evidence: 1. That there was no necessity of a visible head, as now is pretended in the Church of Rome, to unite all the parts of the Catholic Church into one communion. Nor, 2. Any necessity that the whole Catholic Church should agree in all rites, and ceremonies, and customs in indifferent things, which might be various in different Churches, without any breach of Catholic communion. The former of these was sufficiently provided for by the agreement of all Churches in the same faith, and the obligation that lay upon the whole college of bishops, as equal sharers in one episcopacy, to give mutual assistance to each other in all things that were necessary to defend the faith, or preserve the unity of the Church entire in all respects, when any assault was made upon it. It was by this means, and not by any necessary recourse to any single, visible, standing head, that anciently the unity of the Church was preserved. Recourse was sometimes had to the bishop of Rome, as an eminent bishop, who made a considerable figure in the great body of

bishops, and one who, by his station in the imperial city, might be able to succour those that were oppressed in times of great difficulty and distress : but his judgment or opinion was deemed no infallible rule, nor his decision such as was to conclude the rest of the world, so as to tie them down, in no case, without the charge of schism, to vary from him. For sometimes the bishop of Rome fell into manifest heresy, as when Liberius subscribed the Arian blasphemy : in which case, any other bishop was not only at liberty to dissent from him, but was obliged, by virtue of his share in the common episcopacy of the Church, to oppose him, and if occasion required, to pronounce anathema against him ; as St. Hilary did against Liberius,^k when he subscribed to the condemnation of Athanasius, and the Arian creed made at Sirmium. Sometimes again, the bishops of Rome took upon them to exercise a jurisdiction over other Churches, in whose affairs, by right of canon, they had no power : as when Pope Victor set himself to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches for their different way of observing Easter, he was opposed not only by the Asiatic bishops, but by Irenæus and the rest of the world, as going beyond his bounds, and engaging himself in a rash and schismatical undertaking. For he, who by an undue stretch of power not belonging to him, divides others from his communion, is properly the schismatic, by making an unnecessary division in the Church, and not they who by necessity are forced to divide from him. So again, when Pope Zosimus and Celestine took upon them to receive appellants from the African Churches, and absolve those whom they had condemned ; St. Austin and all the African Churches sharply remonstrated against this as an illegal practice, violating the laws of unity, and the settled rules of ecclesiastical commerce, which required that no delinquent excommunicated in one Church should be absolved in another, without giving satisfaction in his own Church that censured him : and therefore to put a stop to this practice, and check the exorbitant power which the Roman bishops assumed to them-

^k Hilar. Fragment. p. 134. Anathema tibi a me dictum, Liberi, et sociis tuis. — Iterum tibi anathema et tertio, prævaricator Liberi.

selves, they first made a law in the Council of Milevis,¹ "That no African clerk should appeal to any Church beyond sea, under pain of being excluded from communion in all the African Churches : " and, then, afterward meeting in a general synod,^m they despatched letters to the bishop of Rome, to remind him how contrary this practice was to the Canons of Nice, which ordered, " That all controversies should be ended in the places where they arose, before a council and the metropolitan." And they withal tell him, " It was unreasonable to think that God should enable a single person to examine the justice of a cause, and deny his grace to a multitude of men assembled in council." This evidently shews, that they did not imagine any single person to be the centre of unity to the whole Church : or that all Churches were obliged to be in communion with the bishop of Rome, whether he were Catholic or heretic ; or that any Church, without the limits of his metropolitical power, was bound in any respect to submit to his jurisdiction. But it manifestly proves, on the contrary, that there was no necessity of a visible head, as is now pretended in the Church of Rome, to unite all the parts of the Catholic Church into one communion ; but that, in matters of faith, every bishop was as much a guardian of the whole Church as the bishop of Rome ; and, in matters of discipline, all Churches were at liberty to hear and determine their own causes in a synod of bishops, without having recourse to any foreign jurisdiction ; as has been more fully demonstrated in other parts of this work,ⁿ to which I refer the reader, for greater satisfaction.

¹ Conc. Milevit. c. xxii. vol. ii. p. 1542. Placuit, ut presbyteri, diaconi, vel ceteri inferiores clerici, in causis, quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant : et inter eos quidquid est, finiant adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab eis provocandum putaverint, non provocent, nisi ad Africana Concilia, vel ad primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur.

^m Cod. Can. African. cc. cxxxv.—cxxxviii.

ⁿ Book ii. chap. v.—Book ix. chap. i. sect. xi.

SECT. XV.—*Nor any Necessity that the whole Church should agree in the same Rites and Ceremonies, which were Things of an indifferent Nature.*

2. It is equally clear, that there was no necessity, in order to maintain the unity of the Catholic Church, that all Churches should agree in all the same rites and ceremonies; but every Church might enjoy her own usages and customs, having liberty to prescribe for herself in all things of an indifferent nature, except where either a universal tradition, or the decree of some general or national council (as has been noted before), intervened to make it otherwise. To this purpose is that famous saying of Irenæus, upon occasion of the different customs of several Churches in observing the Lent fast :^o “ We still retain peace one with another : and the different ways of keeping the fast, only the more commends our agreement in the faith.” St. Jerom, likewise, speaking of the different customs of Churches in relation to the Saturday fast, and the reception of the eucharist every day, lays down this general rule,^p “ That all ecclesiastical traditions, which did noways prejudice the faith, were to be observed in such manner as we had received them from our forefathers, and the custom of one Church was not to be subverted by the contrary custom of another ; but every province might abound in their own sense, and esteem the rules of their ancestors as laws of the apostles.” After the same manner, St. Austin says,^q “ That in all such things, whereabout the Holy Scripture has given no positive

^o Ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. xxiv. (Vales. 156, D.) Πάντες . . . εἰρηνοῦμεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· καὶ ἡ διαφωνία τῆς ὑπεστάτης τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως συνίστησι.

^p Hieron. Epist. xxviii. ad Lucinium Beticum, (Venet. i. 434, E.) Ego illud te breviter admonendum puto, traditiones Ecclesiasticas (præsertim quæ fidei non officiant) ita observandas, ut a majoribus traditæ sunt : nec aliorum consuetudinam, aliorum contrario more subverti . . . sed unaquæque provincia abundet in suo sensu, et præcepta majorum, leges apostolicas arbitretur.

^q Aug. Epist. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. (Bened. vol. ii. p. 52.) In his rebus, de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura Divina, mos populi Dei vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. De quibus si disputare voluerimus, et ex aliorum consuetudine alios improbare, orietur interminata luctatio, quæ labore sermocinationis quum certa documenta nulla veritatis insinuet, utique cavendum est, ne tempestate contentionis serenitatem caritatis obnubilet.

determination, the custom of the people of God, or the rules of our forefathers, are to be taken for laws. For, if we dispute about such matters, and condemn the custom of one Church by the custom of another, that will be an eternal occasion of strife and contention; which will always be diligent enough to find out plausible reasonings, when there are no certain arguments to shew the truth. Therefore great caution ought to be used, that we draw not a cloud over charity, and eclipse its brightness in the tempest of contention." He adds, a little after,^r "Such contention is, commonly, endless, engendering strifes, and terminating no disputes. Let us, therefore, maintain one faith throughout the whole Church, wherever it is spread, as intrinsical to the members of the body, although the unity of faith be kept with some different observations, which in no ways hinder or impair the truth of it. For all the beauty of the King's daughter is within, and those observations, which are differently celebrated, are understood only to be in her outward clothing: whence she is said to be clothed in golden fringes, wrought about with divers colours. But let that clothing be so distinguished by different observations, as that she herself may not be destroyed by oppositions and contentions about them." This was the ancient way of preserving peace in the Catholic Church, to let different Churches, which had no dependence in externals upon one another, enjoy their own liberty to follow their own customs without contradiction. For, as Gregory the Great said to Leander, a Spanish bishop,^s "There is no harm done to the Church Catholic by different customs, so long as the unity of the faith is preserved;" and, therefore, though the Spanish

^r Aug. Epist. lxxxvi. ad Casulan. (Bened. vol. ii. p. 58, D.) Interminabilis est ista contentio, generans lites, non finiens quæstiones. Sit ergo una fides universæ, quæ ubique dilatatur, ecclesiæ, tamquam intus in membris, etiam si ipsa unitas fidei quibusdam diversis observationibus celebratur, quibus nullo modo, quod in fide verum est, impeditur. 'Omnis enim pulchritudo filiæ regis intrinsecus;' illæ autem observationes, quæ varie celebrantur, in ejus veste intelliguntur. Unde ibi dicitur, 'In fimbriis aureis circumamicta varietate.' Sed ea quoque vestis ita diversis celebrationibus varietur, ut non adversis contentionibus dissipetur.

^s Gregor. Mag. Epist. xli. ad Leandrum. In una fide nihil officit sanctæ ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa.

Churches differed in some customs from the Roman Church, yet he did not pretend to oblige them to leave their own customs and usages, to follow the Roman. He gave a like answer to Austin, the monk, archbishop of Canterbury, when he asked him, "What form of Divine service he should settle in Britain, the old Gallican, or the Roman? And how it came to pass, that when there was but one faith, there were different customs in different Churches; the Roman Church having one form of service, and the Gallican Churches another?" To this he replied, "Whatever you find either in the Roman, or Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more pleasing to Almighty God, I think it best that you should carefully select it, and settle it in the use of the English Church, newly converted to the faith. For we are not to love things for the sake of the place, but places for the sake of the good things we find in them; therefore you may collect out of every Church whatever things are pious, religious, and right; and, putting them together, instil them into the minds of the English, and accustom them to the observation of them." And there is no question, but that Austin followed this direction in his new plantation of the English Church.

Neither was this liberty granted to different Churches in bare rituals, and things of an indifferent nature, but sometimes in more weighty points, such as the receiving, or not receiving, those that were baptized by heretics and schismatics, without another baptism. This was a question long debated between the African, and Roman, and other Churches; yet without breach of communion, especially on their part who followed the moderate counsels of Cyprian, who still pleaded for the liberty and independency of different Churches in this matter, leaving all Churches to act

* Gregor. Respons. ad Quæst. Mihi placet, ut, sive in Romana, sive in Gallicarum, seu in qualibet ecclesia, aliquid invenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo placere possit, sollicite eligas; et in Anglorum ecclesia, quæ adhuc ad fidem nova est, institutione præcipua, quæ de multis ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt. Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis, quæ pia, quæ religiosa, quæ certa sunt, elige; et hæc, quasi in fasciculum collecta, apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem depone. — Aug. ap. Bedam, lib. i. c. xxvii. et Gratian. distinct. xii. c. x.

according to their own judgment, and keeping peace and unity with those that differed from him; as has been more fully shewed in a former Book,^u where we discourse of the independency of bishops, especially in the African Churches.

The reader may find an account of some other questions in the same place, as candidly and moderately debated among them as the question about clinic baptism, and the case of admitting adulterers to communion again: in which the practice of the African bishops was often different from one another; but they neither censured each other's practice, nor brake communion upon it. And sometimes the same moderation was observed in doctrinal points of lesser moment: for, as our learned and judicious writers^v have observed out of St. Austin,^w besides the necessary articles of faith, there are other things, about which the most learned and exact defenders of the Catholic rule do not agree, without dissolving the bond of faith. There are some questions in which,^x without any detriment to the faith that makes us Christians, we may safely be ignorant of the truth, or suspend our opinion, or conjecture what is false, by human

^u Book ii. chap. vi.

^v Barrow, of the Unity of the Church, p. 299.—Potter's Answer to Charity Mistaken, sect. iii. p. 88.

^w Aug. cont. Julian. Pelag. Alia sunt, de quibus inter se aliquando doctissimi optime regulæ Catholicæ defensores, salva fidei compage, non consonant.

^x Ibid. de Peccat. Orig. cont. Pelag. et Cælestin. lib. ii. c. xxiii. vol. x. p. 177. Sunt quæstiones, in quibus, salva fide, qua Christiani sumus, aut ignoratur quid verum sit, et sententia definitiva suspenditur, aut aliter quam est, humana et infirma suspitione conjicitur. Veluti quum quæritur, qualis vel ubi sit paradysus, ubi constituit Deus hominem quem formavit ex pulvere; quum tamen esse illum paradysum fides Christiana non dubitet. Vel quum quæritur, ubi sit nunc Elias vel Enoch, an ibi, an alicubi alibi quos tamen non dubitamus, in quibus nati sunt: corporibus vivere. Vel quum quæritur, utrum in corpore an extra corpus in tertium cælum sit raptus apostolus. — Id. Enchirid. c. lix. vol. vi. p. 160, C. Habemus in evangelio, 'Ecce angelus Domini apparuit illis in somnis dicens.' His enim modis velut indicant se angeli contractabilia corpora non habere: faciuntque difficillimam quæstionem, quomodo patres ejus pedes laverint, quomodo Jacob cum angelo tam solida contractatione luctatus sit. Quum ista quærantur, et ea, sicut potest, quisque conjectat, non inutiliter exercentur ingenia, si adhibeatur disceptatio moderata, et absit error opinantium se scire quod nesciunt. Quid enim opus est, ut hæc atque hujusmodi affirmentur vel negentur vel definiantur cum discrimine, quando sine crimine nesciuntur? (Antwerp. Bened. 1700.)

suspicion and infirmity. As in the question about Paradise : What sort of place it is, and where it was that God placed the first man when he had formed him? Where now Enoch and Elias are; in Paradise, or some other place? How many heavens there are, into the third of which St. Paul says he was taken? With innumerable questions of the like nature, pertaining either to the secret work of God, or the hidden parts of Scripture; concerning which he concludes, that a man may be ignorant of them without any prejudice to the Christian faith, or err about them without any imputation of heresy. This consideration made St. Austin profess, in his modesty,¹ “That there were more things in Scripture which he knew not, than what he did know;” and if men should fiercely dispute about such things, and condemn one another for their ignorance or error concerning them, there would be no end of schisms and divisions in the Church; therefore, in such questions, every man was at liberty to abound in his own sense, only observing this rule of peace, not to impose his own opinions magisterially upon others, nor urge his own sentiments as necessary doctrines, or articles of faith, in such points, where either the Scripture was silent, or left every man the liberty of opining.

SECT. XVI.—*What Allowance was made for Men who, out of simple Ignorance, brake Communion with one another.*

Nay, in some cases, a little allowance was made for men of honest minds, who brake communion with one another. For sometimes it happened, that good Catholics were divided among themselves out of ignorance, and brake communion with one another for mere words, not understanding each other's sentiments. In which case all wise and moderate men had a just compassion for each party, and laboured to compose and unite them, without severely condemning either. Nazianzen tells us,² “There was a time

¹ Aug. Epist. cxix. ad Januar. c. xxi. Miror, quia hoc te latet, quod non solum in aliis innumerabilibus rebus multa me latent, sed etiam in ipsis Sanctis Scripturis multo nesciam plura, quam sciam. (Vol. ii. p. 108, D.)

² Nazianz. Orat. xxi. de Laud. Athanas. tom. i. pp. 395, 396, cit. lib. vi. c. iii. sect. ix.

when the ends of the earth were wellnigh divided by a few syllables: it was in a controversy about the use of the words *τρία πρόσωπα* and *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*, in the doctrine of the Trinity. Each party was orthodox, and meant the same thing, under different words; but, not understanding one another's sense, they mutually charged each other with heresy. They, who were for calling the three Divine persons three *hypostases*, charged their adversaries as Sabellians; and they, on the contrary, returned the charge of Arianism upon them, as thinking they had taken three *hypostases*, in the Arian sense, for three essences or substances of a different nature. But the great and good Athanasius, in his admirable prudence and candour, seeing into the false foundations of these disputes, quickly put an end to them, by bringing them to a right understanding of each other's sense, and allowing them to use their own terms, without any difference in opinion. "And this," says our author, "was a more beneficial act of charity to the Church, than all his other daily labours and discourses: it was more honourable than all his watchings and humicubations, and not inferior to his flights and exiles." And, therefore, he tells his readers, in ushering in the discourse, "That he could not omit the relation without injuring them, especially at a time when contentions and divisions were in the Church; for this action of his would be an instruction to them that were then alive, and of great advantage, if they would propound it to their own imitation; since men were prone to divide, not only from the impious, but from the orthodox and pious, and that not only about little and contemptible opinions (which ought to make no difference), but even about words that tended to the same sense, as was evident in the case before them." Such was the candour and prudence of wise and good men in labouring to compose the unnecessary and verbal disputes of the orthodox, when they unfortunately happened to clash and quarrel, without grounds, one with another.

And they had some regard, likewise, to men of honest minds, who, through mere ignorance or infirmity, were engaged in greater errors. For they made a great distinction between heresiarchs and their followers; between the

guides and the people; and between such as were born and bred in the Church, and afterward apostatized into heresy, and those that received their errors from the tradition and seduction of their parents. St. Austin, speaking of this latter sort, says,^a “That they who defend not a false and perverse opinion with any pertinacious animosity, especially if they did not, by any audacious presumption of their own, first invent it, but received it from the seduction of their erring parents, and were careful in their inquiries after truth, being ready to embrace it when they found it, that they were by no means to be reckoned among heretics.” That is, they had not the formality of heresy, which is pride and obstinacy in error; and, therefore, a more favourable opinion might be conceived of them, above others, who first founded heresies, or embraced them afterwards, out of some vicious corruption of mind, having a greater regard to their own lusts, and pleasures of unrighteousness, than any sincere love for truth. Though such weak and injudicious persons could not be wholly excused from error, or schism, or sin; yet, in comparison of others, their case was thought capable of some proper allowances; and, therefore, they were neither so severely punished in the Church here, nor reputed so great objects of God’s displeasure hereafter. For, as Salvian words it, in the case of some who embraced the Arian heresy,^b “They erred indeed, but they erred with a good mind; not out of any hatred to God, but with affection to him, thinking thereby to honour and love the Lord. Although they had not the true faith, yet they imagined this, their opinion, to be perfect charity towards God. And

^a Aug. Epist. clxii. ad Episc. Donat. p. 277, (Bened. vol. ii. p. 67.) Qui sententiam suam, quamvis falsam atque perversam, nulla pertinaci animositate defendunt, et præsertim quam non audacia præsumtionis suæ pepererunt, sed a seductis atque in errorem lapsis parentibus acceperunt, quærunt autem cauta sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, quum invenerint; nequaquam sunt inter hæreticos deputandi.

^b Salvian. de Gubernat. Dei, lib. v. p. 154. Errant, sed bono animo errant; non odio, sed adfectu Dei, honorare se Dominum atque amare credentes. Quamvis non habeant rectam fidem, illi tamen hoc perfectam Dei æstiment caritatem. Qualiter pro hoc ipso falsæ opinionis errore in die judicii puniendi sint, nullus potest scire, nisi judex.

how they shall be punished for this error of their false opinion in the day of judgment, no one knows but the Judge alone."

SECT. XVII. — *Of different Degrees of Unity ; and that no one was esteemed to be in the perfect unity of the Church, who was not in full Communion with her.*

This occasioned a little distinction sometimes to be made between heresiarchs, or the first authors of heresy, and those that were ignorantly drawn into error by their seducement and delusions ; as we shall see more in speaking of the discipline and censures of the Church. In the meantime, I observe, that because the Church could not ordinarily judge of men's hearts, nor always know the means and motives that engaged them in error or schism, she was forced to proceed commonly by another rule, and judge of their unity with her by their external communion and professions. And because there were several sorts and degrees of unity, as we have seen before, so that a man might be in the communion of the Church in one respect, and out of it in another ; therefore the Church went by this rule, to judge none to be in her perfect unity but such as were in full communion with her. Upon which account, though heretics, and schismatics, and excommunicate persons and profane men, were in some sense of the Church, as having received baptism, which they always retained, and as making profession of some part of the Christian faith ; yet because, in other respects, they were broken off from her, they were not esteemed sound and perfect members of the body, but looked upon as withered and decayed branches, for want of such unity, in other respects, as is necessarily required to denominate a man a real and complete Christian, which is a title allowed to none but such as are in full communion with the Church of Christ. This distinction between total and partial unity, and total and partial schism and separation, is of great use to make a man understand all those sayings of the ancients, which speak of heretics, and schismatics, and excommunicate persons, and profligate sinners, as being in some measure in and of the Church, at the same time that

they were reputed really and truly separated from her. Thus Optatus tells the Donatists,^c "That they were divided from the Church in part, not in every respect: for that was the nature of a schism, to be divided in part, not totally cut asunder. And that for very good reason; because both we and you have the same ecclesiastical conversation; though the minds of men be at variance, the sacraments do not vary. We have all the same faith, we are all signed with the same seal: we are no otherwise baptized than you are, nor otherwise ordained than you are. We all read the same Divine Testament; we all pray to the same God. The Lord's Prayer is the same with us as it is with you: but there being a rent made (as was said before) by the parts hanging this way and that way, a union was necessary to restore the whole to its integrity." He repeats this again in other places:^d "Both you and we have the same ecclesiastical conversation, the same common lessons, the same faith, the same sacraments of faith, the same mysteries." And upon this score, he frequently tells them they were their brethren still, whether they would or not. "Though the Donatists hate us," says he,^e "and abhor us, and will not be called our brethren, yet we cannot depart from the fear of God: they are, without doubt, our brethren, though not good brethren. Therefore let no one wonder that I call them brethren, who cannot be otherwise than our brethren,

^c Optat. lib. iii. (p. 78, edit. Paris. 1679.) 'In parte vestis adhuc unum sumus, sed in diversa pendemus.' Quod enim scissum est, ex parte divisum est, non ex toto concisum. Et merito, quia nobis et vobis est una ecclesiastica conversatio: et si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant sacramenta. Denique possumus et nos dicere, 'Pares credimus, et uno sigillo signati sumus: nec aliter baptizati quam vos: Testamentum Divinum legimus pariter: unum Deum rogamus. Oratio Dominiica apud nos et apud vos una est, sed scissura (ut supra diximus) facta, partibus hinc atque hinc pendentibus, sartura necessaria. (Paris. 1631, p. 72.)

^d Ibid. lib. v. (p. 99, edit. cit.) Apud vos et apud nos una est ecclesiastica conversatio, communes lectiones, eadem fides, ipsa fidei sacramenta, eadem mysteria. (Paris. 1631, p. 84.)

^e Ibid. lib. i. (p. 4, edit. cit.) Quamvis et illi (Donatistæ) non negent, et omnibus notum sit, quod nos odio habeant et execrentur, et nolunt se dici fratres nostros; tamen nos recedere a timore Dei non possumus. . . . Sunt igitur sine dubio fratres, quamvis non boni. Quare nemo miretur, eos me appellare fratres, qui non possunt non esse fratres. Est quidem nobis et illis una spiritualis nativitas, sed diversi sunt actus. &c. (Paris. 1631, p. 34.)

seeing both they and we have one and the same spiritual nativity, though our actions are different from one another." "Ye cannot but be our brethren," says he again to them,^f "whom one mother, the Church, hath borne in the same bowels of her sacraments; whom one God, as a father, hath received after one and the same manner, as adopted children. We all pray, 'Our Father which art in heaven:' whence you may perceive, that we are not totally separated from one another, whilst we pray for you willingly, and you pray for us, though against your will. You may hence see, brother Parmenian, that the sacred bonds of brotherhood between us and you, cannot be totally broken asunder." St. Austin always discourses after the same manner concerning this union in part:^g "In many things ye are one with us, in baptism, in the Creed, and the rest of God's sacraments." And hence he also concludes,^h that whether they

^f Optat. lib. iv. p. 77, (p. 88, edit. Paris, 1679.) Non enim potestis non esse fratres, quos iisdem sacramentorum visceribus una mater ecclesia genuit; quos eodem modo adoptivos filios Deus Pater excepit. Unde hujus temporis præscius Christus; quia futurum erat, ut a nobis hodie discordaretis, talia dedit orandi mandata, ut vel in oratione unitas remaneret, ut preces jungerent, quos discrepaturæ fuerant partes. Oramus pro vobis, quia volumus, et vos pro nobis, et quum non vultis: aut dicat unusquisque vestrum, 'Pater meus, qui in cælis es:' et, 'Panem meum quotidianum da mihi hodie:' et 'Dimitte mihi peccata, quomodo et ego debitori meo.' Igitur si quæ mandata sunt, mutari non possunt: Videtis nos non in totum ab invicem esse separatos, dum et nos pro vobis oramus, volentes: et vos pro nobis oretis, etsi nolentes. Vides, frater Parmeniane, sancta germanitatis vincula inter nos et vos in totum rumpi non posse.

^g Aug. Epist. xlviii. ad Vincent. p. 71. In multis estis nobiscum . . . in baptismo, in symbolo, in ceteris Dominicis sacramentis. In spiritu autem unitatis, et vinculo pacis, in ipsa denique Catholica ecclesia, nobiscum non estis. (ii. 189.)

^h Ibid. in Psalm. xxxii. Conc. ii. p. 91, (tom. viii. opp. p. 225, edit. Basil. 1569.) (Bened. vol. iv. p. 153.) Velint nolint, fratres nostri sunt. Tunc esse desinent fratres nostri, si desierint dicere, 'Pater noster.' Dixit de quibusdam propheta, 'His, qui dicunt vobis, Non estis fratres nostri, dicite, Fratres nostri estis.*' Circumspicite, de quibus hoc dicere potuerit: numquid de paganis? Non, neque enim dicimus eos fratres nostros secundum Scripturas, et ecclesiasticum loquendi morem. Numquid de Judæis, qui in Christum non crediderunt? Legite apostolum et videte, quia fratres, quando dicit apostolus sine aliquo additamento, non vult intelligi nisi Christianos: 'Non est autem subjectus,' inquit, 'frater, aut soror in hujusmodi:' quum diceret de conjugio, fratrem et sororem

* Ita tum legebant Verba Iesa. lvi. 5. Vid. Albaspin. in Optat. lib. i. p. 4, not. (1), edit. Paris. 1679.

would or no, they were their brethren, and could not cease to be so, so long as they continued to say, "Our Father," and did not renounce their creed and their baptism. For there was no medium between Christians and Pagans. If they retained faith, and baptism, and the common prayer of the Lord, which teaches all men to style God their Father; so far they were Christians: and as far as they were Christians, so far they were brethren, though turbulent and contentious, who would neither keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," nor continue to be united in the Catholic Church with the rest of their brethren.

- By all this it is evident, 1. That there were different degrees of unity and schism, according to the proportion of which, a man was said to be more or less united to the Church, or divided from it. 2. That they who retained faith, and baptism, and the common form of Christian worship, were in those respects one with the Church; though in other respects, wherein their schism consisted, they were divided from her. So they might be said to be brethren, and not brethren; sons of God, and not sons of God; of the house of God, and not of the house of God; according to the different acceptation of these terms, and the different proportion and degrees of that unity and schism, whereby they were united to the Church, or separated from her. 3. That to give a man the denomination of a true Catholic Christian, absolutely speaking, it was necessary that he should in all

dixit Christianum vel Christianam. Item dicit, 'Tu autem quid judicas fratrem tuum, aut tu quid spernis fratrem tuum?' Et alio loco, 'Vos,' inquit, 'iniquitatem facitis et fraudatis, et hoc fratribus.' Isti ergo qui dicunt, Non estis fratres nostri: paganos nos dicunt. Ideo enim et rebaptizare nos volunt, dicentes nos non habere, quod dant. Unde consequens est error ipsorum, ut negent nos fratres suos esse. Sed quare nobis dixit propheta, 'Vos dicite illis, Fratris nostri estis,' nisi quia nos in eis agnoscimus, quod non repetimus? Illi ergo non agnoscendo baptismum nostrum, negant nos esse fratres: nos autem non repetendo ipsorum, sed agnoscendo nostrum, dicimus eis, Fratres nostri estis. Dicant illi, Quid nos quæritis, quid nos vultis? Respondeamus, fratres nostri estis. Dicunt, Ite a nobis, non vobiscum habemus rationem. Nos prorsus vobiscum rationem habemus: unum Christum confitemur, in uno corpore, sub uno capite esse debemus. . . . Quid ergo me quæris, ait, si perii? Quare quærerem, nisi quia periisti? Si ergo perii, inquit, quomodo sum frater tuus? Ut dicatur mihi de te, 'Frater tuus mortuus erat, et revixit; perierat, et inventus est.' &c.

respects, and in every kind of unity, be in perfect and full communion with the Church ; that is, in faith, in baptism, in holiness of life, in charity, in worship, and all holy offices, and in all the necessary parts of government and discipline : but to denominate a man a schismatic, it was sufficient to break the unity of the Church in any one respect ; though the malignity of his schism was to be interpreted more or less, according to the degrees of the separation that he made from her. And, by these rules, it is easy for any one to understand what the ancients meant by unity and schism ; and how the discipline of the Church was exercised and maintained, by obliging men to live in perfect and full communion with her ; which I come now more particularly to explain and consider.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH, AND THE VARIOUS KINDS OF IT, TOGETHER WITH THE VARIOUS METHODS OBSERVED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF IT.

SECT. I. — *That the Discipline of the Church did not consist in cancelling or disannulling any Man's Baptism.*

THE discipline of the Church being intended, as was observed before, only to preserve the unity and purity of her own members in one communion, we are not to look for the exercise of it upon any but such as in some measure made profession of being joined in society with her ; which were either baptized persons, or at least candidates of baptism : for she pretended not to exercise discipline upon any other which were without, but such only as were within, the pale, in the largest sense, by some act of their own profession. And even upon these she never pretended to exercise her discipline so far, as to cancel or disannul their baptism, so as to oblige them to take a second baptism, if their first was good, in order to be admitted into the Church again, when for any crime they were cast out of it. For even heretics

and apostates, who made the greatest breach of Christian unity, were never so far divided from the Church, but that still they retained some distant relation to her by baptism, whose character was indelible, even in the greatest apostasy that can be imagined, even in the total abjuration of the Christian faith: the obligation of their baptism still lay upon them: and with what severity soever they were treated in their repentance, if ever they returned to the Church again, there is no instance of receiving them by a second baptism; which, if once lawfully given, was for ever after forbidden to be repeated upon any account whatsoever. I will not stand to prove this here, because I have had occasion once or twice before to speak largely upon it;^a but only observe, that it was no part of the discipline of the Church to deny men the original right they had in baptism; and consequently that the most formal casting them out of communion was never intended to signify, that they were mere heathens and pagans, and that they could not be admitted again into the Church, without a repetition of their baptism.

SECT. II.—*But in excluding Men from the common Benefits and Privileges consequent to Baptism.*

But the discipline of the Church consisted in a power to deprive men of all the benefits and privileges of baptism, by turning them out of the society and communion of the Church, in which these privileges were only to be enjoyed; such as joining in public prayer, and receiving the eucharist, and other acts of Divine worship: and sometimes they were wholly forbidden to enter the church, so much as to hear the Scriptures read, or hear a sermon preached, till they shewed some signs of relenting; and every one shunned and avoided them in common conversation, partly to establish the Church's censures and proceedings against them; and partly to make them ashamed; and partly to secure themselves from the danger of contagion and infection.

^a Book xii. chap. v.—Scholastical History of Baptism, part ii. chap. vi.

SECT. III.— *This Power originally a mere Spiritual Power, though, in some Cases, the Secular Arm was called in to give its Assistance.*

Thus far the Church went in her censures by her own natural right and power, but no further: for her power originally was a mere spiritual power; her sword only a ‘spiritual sword,’ as Cyprian terms it,^b to affect the soul, and not the body. Over the bodies of men she pretended no power; no, nor yet over their estates, except such as were purely ecclesiastical, and of her own donation, to resume what was her own property and gift, from such as were contumacious and rebellious against her censures. In which case she sometimes craved assistance from the secular power, even whilst it was heathen, and more frequently when it was become Christian. Thus when the Council of Antioch had deposed Paulus Samosatensis, and substituted Domnus in his room, but could not remove him by any power of their own from the house belonging to the Church, which he still kept possession of, they had recourse to Aurelian, the heathen emperor, who did them justice upon appeal, ordering the house to be delivered to those to whom the bishops of Italy and Rome should write with approbation. “And so,” says Eusebius,^c “Paul was cast out of the Church with the highest disgrace, by the help of the secular power.” This was more common after the emperors were become Christians: for then they could with greater liberty and confidence appeal to them, and beg their assistance upon such occasions. And then canons were made to authorize such addresses, that the censures of the Church might have their effect and force upon contumacious and obstinate offenders. Such an order was made in the Council of Antioch (an. 341), in the reign of Constantius,^d “That if a presbyter, who set up a

^b Cyprian. Epist. lxii. al. iv. ad Pompon. p. 9, (p. 175, edit. Amstelod.) Spirituali gladio superbi et contumaces resecantur, dum de ecclesia ejiciuntur.

^c Euseb. lib. vii. c. xxx. (Vales. p. 231, B.) Μετὰ τῆς ἰσχύατος αἰσχύνῃς, ὑπὸ τῆς ποσειδικῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξιλαύνεται τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

^d Conc. Antioch. c. v. Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καταφρονήσας τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἰδίου, ἀφώρισεν ἑαυτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἰδίᾳ συνήγαγεν, καὶ θυσιαστήριον

separate meeting against his bishop ; and was, after admonition, deposed for his crime, still continued obstinately to disturb and subvert the Church, he should be corrected by the external power [that is, the civil magistrate], as a seditious person." Such another canon was made in the third Council of Carthage,^e in the case of one Cresconius, an African bishop, who having left his own bishoprick, and intruded himself into another, where he stayed in spite of all ecclesiastical censures, orders were given to petition the secular magistrate, by his authority, to remove him. And this canon was inserted, as a general and standing rule, into the African Code.^f Where we have also a like constitution against such presbyters as set up new bishopricks in the diocese of their own bishop without his consent:^g they were to be deprived and removed out of such places, as rebels, ἀρχοντικῇ δυναστείᾳ, 'by the governing power of the secular magistrate.' And in another canon,^h mention is made of letters to be sent from the synod to the magistrates of Afric, to petition them to yield their assistance to their common mother, the Catholic Church, against the Donatists, forasmuch as the authority of bishops was contemned in every city. This petition is more particularly explained in another

ἵστασιν, καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου προκαλισσαμένου ἀπειθεῖν, καὶ μὴ βούλειτο αὐτῷ πείθεσθαι, μηδὲ ὑπακούειν καὶ πρῶτον καὶ διῦτιρον καλοῦντι· τοῦτον καθαιρεῖσθαι παντελῶς, καὶ μηκέτι διεκασίας τυγχάνειν, μηδὲ δύνασθαι λαμβάνειν τὴν ἰαυτοῦ τιμὴν· εἰ δὲ παραμῖνοι δορυῶν καὶ ἀναστατῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, διὰ τῆς ἔξωθεν ἱξουσίας ὡς στασιῶδη αὐτὸν ἐπιστρέφισθαι. (Labb. ii. 564.)

^e Conc. Carth. III. c. xxxviii. (vol. ii. p. 1172, D.) Petimus, secundum quod nobis mandatum est, ut dignemini dare fiduciam, quo jam, necessitate ipsa cogente, liberum sit nobis, rectorem provinciae, secundum statuta gloriosissimorum principum, adversus illum adire ; ut qui miti admonitioni sanctitatis vestrae acquiescere noluit, et emendare illicitum, auctoritate judiciaria protinus excludatur.

^f Cod. Afric. c. xlix. Αἰτούμεν κατὰ τὸ ἰσταλὸν ἡμῖν, ἵνα καταξιώσῃται δοῦναι παρήγοριαν ἐκ' ἀδίας ἡμῖν γινίσθαι· ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ἀνάγκη παρασκευάζει τῷ ἀρχοντι τῆς χώρας κατ' ἐκείνου προσελθεῖν, κατὰ διατάξεις τῶν ἰνδοξοτάτων βασιλίων, ἵνα ὁ σὴ πρὸς ὑπομνήσει τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγιωσύνης συμβαλεχῇ καὶ μὴ διελήσας, καὶ διαφθασθαι τὸ ἀσυνχώρητον, αὐθιγὰ ἀρχοντικῇ παραχερῆμα κωλυθῇ.

^g Ibid. c. liii. Τῶν ἰδίων τόπων ἀρχοντικῇ στερῆσαι ὡς ἀνάρετας, δυναστείας.

^h Ibid. c. lxxvii. "Ἡμεῖς τοῖνον, ἵνα ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας συνόδου γεράμματα πρὸς τοὺς τῆς Ἀφρικῆς ἀρχοντας δοθῶσιν, ἀφ' ὧν αἰτῆσαι ἀμύδιον ἔδοξε, περὶ τοῦ βοηθῆσαι τῇ κοινῇ μητρὶ, τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν οἷς ἡ τῶν ἐπισκόπων αὐθιγία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καταφρονεῖται. (Labb. ii. p. 1090.)

canon,ⁱ which grants a commission to certain bishops to go as legates, in the name of the Church, to the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius, and complain of the violences offered by the Donatists, who had invaded many of their churches, and kept them by force; against which they desired the emperors to grant them a suitable help by a military guard; it being no unusual thing, nor against the Scripture, to be protected, as St. Paul was, by a band of soldiers, against the conspiracy of insolent and factious men. They requested also, "That the emperors would put in execution the law, which Theodosius, their father, of pious memory, had enacted against heretics, whereby every one that ordained, or was ordained by them, was amerced in the sum of ten pounds of gold." The law they refer to, is still extant in the Theodosian Code, running in these terms:^j "If proof is made against any who are engaged in heretical errors, that they either have ordained clerks, or received the office of a clerk, a mulct of ten pounds in gold, is, by our order, to be imposed upon them: and the place in which any of these unlawful things were attempted, if done by the connivance of the owner, shall be confiscated. But if the possessor was ignorant of the matter, then he that rented the farm, if he be a freeman, shall forfeit ten pounds of gold to the exchequer; or if he be descended of a servile condition, cannot bear the penalty, then he shall be beaten with rods,

ⁱ Cod. Afric. c. xciii. (ii. 1110.) Κατὰ τῆς ἐκείνων μανίας δυνάμιθα συμμαχίας θείας τυχεῖν, οὐκ ἀθέως δι, οὐδὲ ἀλλοτριᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν, ὁπόταν Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὡς ταῖς ἀληθιναῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων διδύλωται, τὴν σύμπαντι τῶν ἀτάκτων στρατιωτικῇ ἐπικρίνῃσι βοηθίᾳ. . . ἄμα καὶ τοῦτο δι' αἰτήσαι, ὥστε τὸν νόμον, τὸν ἐκτείνοντα παρὰ τοῦ τῆς ἐκείνου μνήμης πατρός αὐτῶν Θεοδοσίου, τὸν περὶ τῶν δίκαι τοῦ χροσίου λιτρῶν, τὸν κατὰ τῶν χειροτονούντων καὶ χειροτονουμένων αἰρετικῶν φυλάττειν, ἵτι μὴν καὶ κατὰ κτητόρων, τῶν παρ' οἷς ἡ ἐκείνων εὐρεθὴ συναγωγή εἴθ' οὕτως βεβαιωθῇαι τὸν τοιοῦτον νόμον κελύουσιν, ὡς ἰσχύειν κατὰ τούτων, ὃν διὰ τὰς ἐκείνου οἱ τῆς καθολικῆς προσηρπύοντες διαμαρτυρίαν ἐκτείνοντο.

^j Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. xxi. In hæreticis erroribus, quoscunque constiterit vel ordinasse clericos, vel suscepisse officium clericorum, denis libris auri viritum multandos esse censemus: locum sane, in quo vetita temptantur, si conhibentia domi patuerit, fisci nostri viribus adgregari. Quod si id possessorem (quippe clanculum gestum) ignorasse constiterit, conductorem ejus fundi, si ingenuus est, decem auri libras fisco nostro inferre præcipimus: si servili facie descendens, paupertate sui, pœnam damni, ac vilitate contemnit, cæsus fustibus deportatione damnabitur. (Lugd. 1665, vol. vi. p. 138.)

and sent into banishment." This was that famous penal law of Theodosius, against all heretics in general, so often mentioned by St. Austin; and which he, with the rest of the African fathers, desired Honorius to confirm, so as it might specify and affect the Donatists, more particularly such of them as, by open or secret violence, made assaults upon the Catholic Church. They did not desire that this penalty should be inflicted indifferently upon all the Donatists, but only such as the Circumcellions and others, who, in their mad zeal and fury, committed violent outrages against the Catholics: but Honorius extended the penalty to them all, and enforced the old law of Theodosius his father, by a new law of his own, wherein the Donatists were particularly named as heretics, who upon conviction, or confession, were to be fined in the sum of ten pounds of gold, according to the tenour of the former law.^k No one better understood either the reasons or the effects of this law than St. Austin; and therefore it cannot be better explained than as Gothofred does it in his words. Now he, writing to Count Boniface, an African magistrate, gives this account of it: "Before those laws," says he,^l "were sent into Afric, which compel heretics to come into the church, some of our brethren, among whom I was one, were of opinion, that although the madness of the Donatists raged every where, yet we should not petition the emperors to forbid any one simply to be of that heresy, by inflicting punishment on all that embraced it; but only desire them to make a law to restrain them from offering violence to any other that either preached or held the Catholic faith. Which we thought might, in some

^k Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. xxxix. Donatistæ superstitionis hæreticos, quocumque loci, vel fatentes, vel convictos, legis (Theodosianæ) tenore servato, pœnam debitam absque dilatione persolvere decernimus. (P. 158.)

^l Aug. Epist. l. ad Bonifac. p. 84, (p. 219, edit. Basil. 1569.) (Antwerp. Bened. vol. ii. p. 467, D. 9.) Antequam istæ leges, quibus ad convivium sanctum coguntur intrare, in Africam mitterentur, nonnullis fratribus videbatur, in quibus et ego eram, quamvis Donatistarum rabies usquequaque sæviret, non esse petendum ab imperatoribus, ut ipsam hæresin juberent omnino non esse, pœnam constituendo eis, qui in illa esse voluissent; sed hoc potius constituerent, ut eorum furiosas violentias non paterentur, qui veritatem Catholicam vel prædicarent loquendo, vel legerent constituendo. Quod eo modo fieri aliquatenus posse arbitrabamur, si legem piissimæ memoriæ Theodosii, quam generaliter in omnes hæreticos promulgavit, 'ut quis-

measure, be done after this manner: if the law of Theodosius of pious memory, which he had promulged against all heretics in general, 'That whoever was found to be a bishop or clerk, any where among them, should forfeit ten pounds in gold,' were more expressly confirmed against the Donatists (who denied themselves to be heretics), in such a manner, as that the penalty should not be inflicted upon them all, but only upon such in whose regions the Catholic Church suffered violence from their clergy, or the Circumcellions, or their people, so as after the protestation of the Catholics, who suffered from them, the magistrates should compel their bishops or ministers to pay the fine. For so we thought that, by this means, they might be terrified from daring any such attempts; and the Catholic truth might be taught and held freely, so as no one should be compelled to it, but every one that would, might embrace it without fear, and we should have no false or counterfeit Catholics. And though others of our brethren were of a different opinion (who, by their age, had greater experience, and could plead the example of many cities and places where we saw the Catholic Church firmly and truly settled, which yet was there settled by such kind methods of Divine Providence, whilst men were compelled, by the laws of former emperors, to come in to the Catholic communion); yet, notwithstanding this, we prevailed that our petition should be presented to the empe-

quis eorum episcopus vel clericus, ubilibet esset inventus, decem libris auri multaretur,' expressius in Donatistas, qui se negabant hæreticos, ita confirmarent, ut non omnes ea multa ferirentur, sed in quorum regionibus aliquas violentias a clericis, vel a Circumcellionibus, vel populis eorum, ecclesia Catholica pateretur; ut scilicet post protestationem Catholicorum, qui fuissent ista perpassi, jam cura ordinum ad persolvendam multam episcopi sive ministri ceteri tenerentur. Ita enim existimabamus, eis territis et nihil tale facere audentibus, posse libere doceri et teneri Catholicam veritatem, ut ad eam cogeretur nemo, sed eam, qui sine formidine vellet, sequeretur, ne falsos et simulatores Catholicos haberemus. Et quamvis aliis fratribus aliud videretur, jam ætate gravioribus, vel multarum civitatum et locorum exempla cernentibus, ubi firmam et veram Catholicam videbamus, quæ tamen ibi talibus beneficiis Dei constituta esset et firmata, dum per priorum imperatorum leges ad communionem homines Catholicam cogerentur; obtinuimus tamen, ut illud potius, quod dixi, ab imperatoribus peteretur; decretum est in concilio nostro, legati ad comitatum missi sunt. Sed Dei major misericordia, qui sciret, harum legum terror, et quædam medicinalis molestia, quam multorum esset pravis

rors, in the foresaid form. And thereupon a decree was drawn up in Council, and our legates were despatched to court. But the greater mercy of God (who better knew how necessary the terror of such laws, and a little medicinal trouble is, for the wicked or cold hearts of many men, and for that hardness of mind which cannot be corrected by words, but may by a little severity of discipline), so ordered the matter, that our legates could not obtain the thing they had undertaken. For before they could get to court to present our petition, several grievous complaints had been made by the bishops of other places, who had suffered extremely by the Donatists, and were driven from their sees by them: especially the horrible and incredible murder of Maximian, the Catholic bishop of Vaga, made it impossible for our embassy to succeed. For now a law was already promulged against the barbarous Donatist heresy, the very sparing which seemed more cruel than the cruelty which themselves exercised, that not only its violence, but its very being, should not be tolerated or suffered to go unpunished. Yet to observe Christian meekness, even toward the unworthy, the penalty proposed was not death, but only a pecuniary mulct, and banishment for the bishops and ministers." Then relating particularly the barbarous usage of Maximian, and their unparalleled cruelty towards him, he adds, "That the emperor being well apprised of these facts,

vel frigidis animis necessaria, et illi duriæ, quæ verbis emendari non potest, sed tamen aliquantula severitate disciplinæ potest, id egit, ut legati nostri, quod susceperant, obtinere non possent. Jam enim nos præveniant ex aliis locis quædam episcoporum querelæ gravissimæ, qui mala fuerant ab ipsis multa perpessi, et a suis sedibus exturbati; præcipue horrenda et incredibilis cædes Maximiani, episcopi Catholici ecclesiæ Bagaiensis effecit, ut nostra legatio jam quid ageret, non haberet. Jam enim lex fuerat promulgata, ut tantæ immanitatis hæresis Donatistarum, cui crudelius parci videbatur, quam ipsa sæviebat, non tantum violenta esse, sed omnino esse non sineretur impune: non tamen supplicio capitali, propter servandam etiam circa indignos mansuetudinem Christianam, sed pecuniariis damnis propositis, et in episcopos vel ministros eorum exilio constituto. . . . Hinc factum est, ut imperator religiosus et pius, perlatis in notitiam suam talibus causis, mallet piissimis legibus illius impietatis errorem omnino corrigere, et eos, qui contra Christum Christi signa portarent, ad unitatem Catholicam terrendo et coercendo redigere, quam sæviendi tantummodo auferre licentiam, et errandi ac pereundi relinquere. . . . Quum ipsæ leges venissent in Africam, præcipue illi

in his great piety and concern for religion, chose rather universally to correct that impious error by wholesome laws, and reduce those who carried the badge of Christ against Christ, to Catholic unity, by terror and punishment, than barely to take from them the liberty of exercising their cruelty, and leave them at liberty to err and perish." He observes further, "That as soon as ever these laws appeared in Afric, they wrought wonderful effects upon the minds of men: for immediately all such as waited only for a proper occasion, or were kept back merely by the dread of the cruelty of those frantic men, or were afraid to offend their relations, came over at once to the Catholic Church. Many, also, who were detained in schism, merely by the custom they had been trained up to by their parents, but had never spent a thought about the grounds and reasons of their error, nor would consider or make inquiry into the merits of the cause; when once they began to consider it, and found nothing in it worth suffering so great loss, they, without any difficulty, became Catholic Christians. For a concern for their own safety brought them to understanding, who, before, were grown negligent by security. Many also, who were less capable of understanding and judging by themselves, what was the difference between the error of the Donatists and the Catholic truth, were induced to follow the authority and persuasion of so many examples going before them. So the true mother received great multitudes of people into her

qui quærebant occasionem, aut sævitiam furentium metuebant, aut suos verecundabantur offendere, ad ecclesiam continuo transierunt. Multi etiam, qui sola illic a parentibus tradita consuetudine tenebantur, qualem vero causam ipsa hæresis haberet, numquam quærere et considerare voluerant, mox ubi cœperunt advertere et nihil in ea dignum invenire, propter quod tanta damna paterentur, sine ulla difficultate Catholici facti sunt. Docuit enim eos sollicitudo, quos negligentes securitas fecerat. Istorum autem omnium præcedentium auctoritatem et persuasionem sequuti sunt multi, qui minus idonei erant per se ipsos intelligere, quid distaret inter Donatistarum errorem et Catholicam veritatem. Ita quum magna agmina populorum vera mater in sinum gaudens reciperet, remanserunt turbæ duræ, et in illa peste infelici animositate sistentes. Ex his quoque plurimi simulando communicaverunt, alii paucitate latuerunt. Sed illi, qui simulabant, paullatim adsuescendo et prædicationem veritatis audiendo, maxime post collationem et disputationem, quæ inter nos et episcopos eorum apud Carthaginem fuit, ex magna parte correcti sunt.

bosom again, rejoicing, and only a hardened company remained obstinate, by their unhappy animosity, in that pernicious way. And many of these also communicated with the Church by a sort of dissimulation: but they who first dissembled, afterwards by degrees accustoming themselves to the way of the Church, and hearing the preaching of truth, especially after the conference and disputation which was held between their bishops and us at Carthage, did at last, for the most part, correct their errors also."

This is the account which St. Austin gives both of the reasons and effects of this penal law, which he frequently^m

^m Aug. Epist. lxxviii. ad Januar. cit. Gothofredo ad Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. xxxix. p. 159, a. (ii. 164.) Crispinus judicatus hæreticus, nec pœna decem librarum auri, quæ in hæreticos ab imperatoribus fuerat constituta, per mansuetudinem Catholicam ferri permissus est, et tamen ad imperatores appellandum putavit. Cujus appellationi quod ita responsum est, nonne vestrorum præcedens improbitas et eadem ipsius appellatio extorsit, ut fieret: nec tamen etiam post ipsum rescriptum, intercedentibus apud imp. nostris episcopis, eadem auri condemnatione mulctatus est? Ex concilio autem nostri episcopi legatos ad comitatum miserunt, qui impetrarent; ut non omnes episcopi et clerici partis vestræ ad eandem condemnationem decem librarum auri, quæ in omnes hæreticos constituta est, tenerentur; sed hi soli, in quorum locis aliquas a vestris violentias ecclesia Catholica pateretur. Sed quum legati Romam venerunt, jam cicatrices episcopi Catholici Bagaitani horrendæ ac recentissimæ imperatorem commoverant, ut leges tales mitterentur; quales et missæ sunt.—Id. Epist. clxvi. ad Donatistas. (ii. 226, A.) Et tamen quum Crispinus propter hoc factum in proconsulari judicio convinceretur hæreticus, ejusdem episcopi Possidii intercessu decem libras auri non est exactus. Cui benevolentia et mansuetudini ingratus, ad imperatores Catholicos ausus est appellare. Unde hanc in vos iram Dei de qua murmuratis, multo importunius et vehementius provocavit.—Id. lib. iii. cont. Cresconium, c. xlvii. (ix. 314.) Crispinus igitur exhibitus, et quod se esse proconsuli quærenti negaverat, facillime convictus hæreticus, decem tamen libras auri, quam mulctam in omnes hæreticos imperator major Theodosius constituerat, intercedente Possidio, non est compulsus exsolvere. Qua mitissima sententia non contentus, nescio quo consilio, quod displicuisse vestris omnibus dicebatur, ad ejusdem Theodosii filios provocandum putavit. Acceptatum est, rescriptum est. Quid aliud, nisi quod pars Donati jam sciret se ad illam pœnam aurariam cum ceteris hæreticis pertinere? &c.—Id. cont. litt. Petiliani, lib. ii. c. lxxxiii (ix. 182.) Ipsa Catholica ecclesia solidata principibus Catholicis imperatoribus terra marique armatis turbis ab Optato atrociter et hostiliter oppugnata est. Quæ res coëgit tunc primo adversus vos allegari apud vicarium Seranum legem illam de decem libris auri, quas vestrum nullus adhuc pendit, et nos crudelitatis arguitis.—Id. Epist. ad Crispinum ipsum, clxxiii. Nam possemus agere, ut decem libras auri secundum imperatoria jussa persolveres. An forte propterea non habes, unde reddas, quod dare jussi sunt rebaptizatores, dum mulctam erogas, ut emas, quos rebaptizes? (Bened. vol. ii. p. 117, B.)

mentions in other places, carefully collected by Gothofred, but needless here to be recited. I only observe these few things upon the whole matter: 1. That though it was no part of the Church's discipline to use any manner of force to give effect to her censures, yet, in case of obstinate opposition and contempt, she did not think it unlawful to take the assistance of the secular power. 2. That in case of violence offered to the Church, or any of her ministers or her members, there was still more reason to petition for defence against them. 3. That it was generally thought useful to inflict some moderate temporal punishments upon obstinate heretics, and schismatics, and other offenders (with a liberty of indulging, and remitting the penalty, as prudence directed), in order to bring them to consider and examine the grounds of truth and error, and humble them by repentance, and restore them to the communion of the Church, from whence they were fallen.

SECT. IV.—*This Assistance never required to proceed so far, as, for mere Error, to take away Life, or shed Blood.*

But, then, it is also to be considered, that the Church never encouraged any magistrate to proceed further in her behalf against any one for any mere error, or ecclesiastical misdemeanour, than to punish the delinquent with a pecuniary mulct, or bodily punishment short of death, such as confiscation or banishment, unless it were in case of capital crimes, and of a civil nature, which fell directly under the cognizance of the civil magistrate, as treason or rebellion, which the imperial laws punished with death. There are, indeed, some laws in the Theodosian Code, which order heretics to be prosecuted with capital punishments. Theodosius^a made a decree against some of the Manichees, which went by the name of Encratites, Saccofori, and Hydroparastatæ, that they should be punished with death; at the same time that the Solitarii, another sect among them, should only suffer confiscation. And Honorius renewed the

^a Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. ix. Quos Encratitas prodigiali appellatione cognominant, cum Saccoforis sive Hydroparastatis . . . summo supplicio et inexpiabili pœna jubemus adfligi. (Lugd. 1665, vol. vi. p. 124.)

same law against them.^o And in two other laws he ordered the Donatists^p in Afric to be put to death, if they held any public conventicles to the prejudice of the Catholic faith, revoking all tolerations that had been granted them before. But, as these laws were very rare, so they may be supposed to be made upon some particular provocation of their enormities, such as the Manichees were guilty of; or their barbarous outrages committed against the Catholics, such as the Circumcellions, among the Donatists, every where stand charged with. Then, again, it was as rare to find these laws at any time put in execution against them: for we scarce find an instance, before Priscillian, of any heretic suffering death barely for his opinion. Sozomen, speaking of this law of Theodosius, says,^q “It was made more for terror than execution.” And Chrysostom, at the same time, delivered his opinion freely,^r “That the tares were not thus to be rooted out: for, if heretics were to be put to death, there would be nothing but eternal war in the world. Christ does not prohibit us to restrain heretics, to stop their mouths, to cut off their liberty, and their meetings, and their conspiracies, but only to kill and slay them.” St. Austin seems not to have known any thing of this law of Theodosius; and for those of Honorius, they were not yet enacted against the Donatists, when he wrote against them. Therefore, writing

^o Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. xxxv. Noxios Manichæos, execrabilesque eorum conventus, dudum justa animadversione damnatos, etiam speciali præceptione cohiberi decernimus. Quapropter quæsitæ adducantur in publicum, ac detestati criminosi congrua et severissima emendatione resecuntur. (P. 153.)

^p Ibid. leg. li. Oraculo penitus remoto, quo ad ritus suos hæreticæ superstitiones obrepserant, sciant omnes sanctæ legis inimici, plectendos se pena et proscriptionis et sanguinis, si ultra convenire in publicum, execranda sceleris sui temeritate, temptaverint. (P. 170).—See leg. lvi.

^q Sozom. lib. vii. c. xii. (Vales. p. 584, C.) Χαλεπὰς τοῖς νόμοις ἐπίγραφαι τιμωρίας· ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐπιζήν· οὐ γὰρ τιμωρῆσθαι, ἀλλ’ εἰς διὸς καθιστᾶν τοὺς ὑπηκόους ἰσποῦδαζεν.

^r Chrysostom. Hom. xlvi. in Matth. p. 422, (p. 514, edit. Francof.) Τί οὖν δισπότης; κωλύει, λίγων, Μή ποτε ἐκριζώσῃσι ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σίτον. τοῦτο δὲ ἔστιν, κωλύων πολέμους γίνεσθαι καὶ αἵματα καὶ σφαγὰς· οὐ γὰρ δι’ ἀνακρίναι αἰρετικόν· ἐπεὶ ὁ πόλεμος ἄσπονδος εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην ἑμὲλλον εἰσάγεσθαι. . . οὐ τοῖσιν κατ’ ἔχιν αἰρετικούς καὶ πιστοποιεῖν, καὶ ἐκκόπτειν αὐτῶν τὴν παρβήσιαν, καὶ τὰς συνόδους, καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς διαλύει κωλύει· ἀλλ’ ἀνακρίναι καὶ κατασφάττειν.

frequently to the African magistrates, he tells them, "The law gave them no power to put any Donatist to death." Thus, in his letter to Dulcitius, the tribune :^{*} "You," says he, "have not received the power of the sword against them by any laws; neither, by any imperial injunctions which you are obliged to execute, are you commanded to put them to death." So he tells Petilian, the Donatist bishop,[†] "That God had so ordered the matter, in his providence, having the hearts of kings in his hand, that though the emperor had made many laws to admonish and correct them, yet there was no imperial law which commanded them to be put to death. The judges, indeed, had power to punish malefactors with death, as murderers, and the like: and so, perhaps, some of the Donatists might suffer; but that was not for their opinion barely. And even, in that case, when it was the cause of the Church, the Catholic bishops commonly interceded for them, that the deaths of their martyrs might not be revenged with blood. "For no good men in the Catholic Church," says St. Austin,[‡] "are pleased to have any one, although he be a heretic, prosecuted unto death." Therefore, writing to one Donatus, a proconsul in Afric, he tells him,[§] "They desired that the terror of judges and laws might correct them, so as to preserve them from the punishment of eternal judgment, but not kill them; that discipline might not be neglected toward them, and, yet, that they might not undergo the punishment which they really deserved: therefore punish their crimes in such manner, as

^{*} Aug. Epist. lxi. ad Dulcitium. Non tu in eos jus gladii ullis legibus accipisti; aut imperialibus constitutis, quorum tibi injuncta est executio, hoc præceptum est, ut necentur. (Bened. ii. 582, E.)

[†] Ibid. cont. litt. Petiliani, lib. ii. c. lxxxvi. Si occisori fratris Deus noluit inferri mortem, sed relinqui carnificem vitam; vide, ne forte hoc sit, unde multas ad vos commonendos et corripiendos leges ipse constituit: nulla tamen lex regia vos jussit occidi, &c. (Bened. vol. ix. p. 184, C. 4.)

[‡] Ibid. cont. Crescon. lib. iii. c. l. Nullis bonis in Catholica (ecclesia) hoc placet, si usque ad mortem in quemquam, licet hæreticum, sæviatur. (ix. 315, B. 3.)

[§] Ibid. Epist. cxxvii. ad Donat. (Bened. vol. ii. p. 204, E.) Ex occasione terribilium judicium ac legum, ne in æterni judicii pœnas incidunt, corrigi eos cupimus, non necari; nec disciplinam circa eos negligi volumus, nec suppliciiis, quibus digni sunt, exerceri. Sic igitur eorum peccata compesce, ut sint, quos pœniteat peccasse. Quæsumus igitur, ut quum ecclesiæ causas audis, quamlibet nefariis

that the authors may continue in being, to repent of them. We beseech you, when any cause of the Church comes before you, although you know the Church to be assaulted and afflicted by their injurious villanies, yet then forget that you have the power of killing, and do not forget our petition. Let it not seem vile and contemptible in your eyes, that we, who pray to God to correct them, intercede with you not to kill them. Let your prudence also consider this, that no one besides ecclesiastics is concerned to bring ecclesiastical causes before you: so that if you should resolve to put such criminals to death, who are accused of acting wickedly against the Church, you will deter us from bringing any more such actions before your tribunal: and that will make them more licentious, and daringly bold to assault us, and work our ruin, when they know we are under such a necessity, to choose rather to be slain by them, than bring them to be slain before your tribunals." He pleads, after the same manner, in another letter to Marcellinus, the tribune, in behalf of some Donatists, who confessed themselves guilty of murdering some of the Catholic clergy. "I beseech you," says he,¹ "let their punishment be short of death, though their crimes be so great, both for our conscience sake, and to commend the lenity and meekness of the Catholic Church." A little after he entreats him to intercede, in his name, to the proconsul for them.² "I hear it is in the

injuriis appetitam vel adflictam esse cognoveris, potestatem occidendi te habere obliviscaris, et petitionem nostram non obliviscaris. Non tibi vile sit, neque contemptibile, fili honorabiliter dilectissime, quod vos rogamus ne occidantur, pro quibus Dominum rogamus, ut corrigantur. Excepto etiam, quod a perpetuo proposito recedere non debemus vincendi in bono malum: illud quoque prudentia tua cogitet, quod causas ecclesiasticas insinuare vobis nemo præter ecclesiasticos curat. Proinde si occidendos in his sceleribus homines putaveritis, deterrebitis nos, ne per operam nostram ad vestrum judicium aliquid tale perveniat: quo comperito illi in nostram perniciem licentiore audacia grassabuntur, necessitate nobis impacta et indicta, ut etiam occidi ab eis eligamus, quam eos occidendos vestris judiciis ingeramus.

¹ Aug. Epist. clviii. ad Marcellin. (p. 718, edit. Basil.) *Pœna sane illorum, quamvis de tantis sceleribus confessorum, rogo te, ut præter supplicium mortis sit, et propter conscientiam nostram, et propter Catholicam mansuetudinem commendandam.* (Bened. ii. p. 318, C.)

² Ibid. (Bened. p. 319, A.) *Soleo audire, in potestate esse judicis mollire sententiam, et mitius vindicare, quam jubeant leges. Si autem nec litteris meis ad*

power of the judge to mollify the rigour of the law in giving sentence, and to use greater mildness in punishing than the laws command. But if he will not, at my request, consent to this, let him, however, grant me this favour, to keep them in prison till I can send to the emperor, and obtain of his clemency, that the passions or martyrdoms of the servants of God, which ought to be glorious in the Church, be not stained and defiled with the blood of their enemies." He urges the same argument in his next letter to this Marcellinus with greater earnestness, conjuring him, by all that is sacred, not to proceed to the utmost extremity against some Circumcellions and Donatist clergy, who were convicted of murdering two of his presbyters, belonging to the Church of Hippo, after having first barbarously struck out an eye, and cut off the finger of one of them. "I am under the greatest concern imaginable," says he,^b "lest your highness should decree their punishment, by the utmost severity of the law, to make them suffer the same things that they have done; therefore I beseech you in these letters, by the faith which you have in Christ, by the mercy of the Lord Jesus, that you neither do this, nor suffer it to be done. For though we might excuse ourselves from their death, forasmuch as it was not by any accusation of ours, but by the information of those who have the care of preserving the public peace, that they were brought in question; yet we would not have the passions of the servants of God be revenged with the like

hoc consenserit, hoc saltem præstet, ut in custodiam recipiantur, atque hoc de clementia imperatoris impetrare curabimus, ne passiones servorum Dei, quæ debent esse in ecclesia gloriosæ, inimicorum sanguine dehoneantur.

^b Aug. Epist. clix. ad Marcellin. (Bened. vol. ii. p. 300, D.) *Mihi sollicitudo maxima incussa est, ne forte sublimitas tua censeat eos tanta legum severitate plectendos, ut qualia fecerunt, talia patiantur. Ideoque his litteris obtestor fidem tuam, quam habes in Christo, per ipsius Domini Christi misericordiam, ut hoc ne facias, nec fieri omnino permittas. Quamvis enim ab eorum interitu dissimulare possemus, qui non accusantibus nostris, sed illorum notoria, ad quos tuendæ publicæ pacis vigilantia pertinebat, præsentati videantur examini; nolumus tamen passiones servorum Dei, quasi vice talionis, paribus suppliciis vindicari. Non quo scelestis hominibus licentiam facinorum prohibeamus auferri; sed hoc magis sufficere volumus; ut vivi et nulla corporis parte truncati, vel ab inquietudine insana ad sanitatis otium legum coërcitione dirigantur, vel a malignis operibus alicui utili operi deputentur.*

punishments, as it were by way of retaliation. Not that we are against depriving wicked men of the liberty of committing such villanous actions, but because we rather think it sufficient, without either killing them, or maiming them in any part of their body, to bring them, by coercion of the laws, from these mad and turbulent practices, to live peaceably and soberly; or, at least, instead of these wicked works, to engage them in some useful employment." He yet, again, more pathetically urges the same matter to one Apringius, another African judge,^c in these very affectionate and moving terms, pleading for mercy toward the same Circumcellions. "I am afraid lest they, who have committed this murder, should be sentenced to death by your power. That this may not be done, I, that am a Christian, beseech you, the judge: I, that am a bishop, exhort you, that are a Christian. I know the apostle says, 'Ye bear not the sword in vain, but are ministers of God, to execute wrath upon them that do evil;' but the cause of the state is one thing, and the cause of the Church another. The administration of that (the state) is to be carried on by terror; but the meekness of the Church is to be commended by her clemency." Then using several arguments, he adds, a little after, "If nothing short of death could be imposed upon them,

^c Aug. Epist. clx. ad Apringium, (Bened. vol. ii. p. 301, F.) Quum comperissem illos fuisse confessos (cædem istorum duorum presbyterorum) ideoque minime dubitarem sub jura tuæ securis esse venturos, has ad [tuam] nobilitatem litteras acceleravi, quibus deprecor, et per misericordiam Christi obsecro, sic de tua majore atque certiore felicitate gaudeamus, ut eis paria non retribuuntur; quamquam lapidis ictibus digitum præcidere oculumque convellere leges puniendo non possunt, quod isti saviendo potuerunt. Unde securus sum de iis, qui hoc se fecisse confessi sunt, quod hanc vicissitudinem non reportabunt: sed ne vel ipsi, vel illi, quorum homicidium patefactum est, per tuæ potestatis sententiam mulcentur, hoc timeo; hoc ne fiat, et Christianus judicem rogo, et Christianum episcopus moneo. 3. De vobis quidem dixisse apostolum legimus, 'quod non sine causa gladium geratis, et ministri Dei sitis, vindices in eos, qui male agunt.' Sed alia causa est provinciæ, alia est ecclesiæ. Illius terribiliter gerenda est administratio, hujus clementer commendanda est mansuetudo. Si apud judicem non Christianum mihi sermo esset, aliter agerem: nec tamen etiam sic ecclesiæ causam desererem; et quantum admittere dignaretur, instarem, ne passiones servorum Dei Catholicorum, quæ prodesse debent ad exempla patientiæ, inimicorum suorum sanguine fœdarentur; et si nollet acquiescere, inimico animo eum resistere suspicarer. Nunc vero, quando apud te res agitur, alia mihi ratio est, alia consultatio.

for our part we had rather they should be set at liberty, than that the passions of our brethren should be revenged by shedding the blood of their enemies. But, now, since there is room both to shew the gentleness of the Church, and also to restrain the audaciousness of the cruel, why should you not incline to the more provident side, and milder sentence, which judges have liberty to do, even in causes where the Church is not concerned? Therefore stand in awe with us of the judgment of God the Father, and demonstrate the clemency of the Church, your mother. For what you do the Church does, for whose sake you do it, and whose you are, that do it: therefore contend and vie in goodness with the evil. They, by monstrous inhumanity and wickedness, tear off the members from the living body: do you, in mercy, cause their members, which were exercised in such barbarous works, to remain whole and untouched in them, that they may henceforth serve to work at some useful labour. They spared not the servants of God, preaching reformation to them; but do you spare them that have been apprehended in their crimes; spare them that have been presented to your examination; spare them that have been convicted before you. They, with the sword of unrighteousness, shed Christian blood: do you withhold even the

Rectorem te quidem præcelsæ potestatis videmus, sed etiam filium Christianæ pietatis agnoscimus. Subdatur sublimitas tua, subdatur fides tua, causam tecum tracto communem: sed tu in ea potes, quod ego non possum. Confer nobiscum consilium, et porrige auxilium. 4. Diligenter actum est, ut inimici ecclesiæ, qui solent vaniloquio seductionis sollicitare animos imperitos, tamquam de persecutione gloriantes, quam se perpeti jactant, horrenda facinora sua in Catholicos clericos perpetrata faterentur, et suis verbis implicarentur. Legenda sunt Gesta ad sanandas animas, quas pestifera suasionem venenaverunt. Numquid placet tibi, ut ad finem Gestorum, si cruentum istorum supplicium continebit, legendo pervenire timeamus, ubi ponimus et ipsam conscientiam, ne malum pro malo, qui passi sunt, reddidisse videantur? Si ergo nihil aliud constitueretur frenandæ malitiæ perditorum, extrema fortasse necessitas, ut tales occiderentur, urgeret: quamquam, quod ad nos attinet, si nihil mitius eis fieri posset, malleus eos liberos relaxari, quam passiones fratrum nostrorum fuso eorum sanguine vindicari: nunc vero, quum aliquid fieri potest, quo et mitis commendetur ecclesia, et imitium cohibeatur audacia; cur non flectas in partem providentiorum lenioremque sententiam, quod licet iudiciis facere, etiam non in causis ecclesiæ? Time ergo nobiscum iudicium Dei Patris, et commenda mansuetudinem matris. Quum enim tu facis, ecclesia facit, propter quam facis, et cujus filius facis. Contende bonitate cum malis.

lawful sword of judgment from being imbrued in their blood. They slew the minister of the Church, and thereby deprived him of the time of living: do you let the enemies of the Church live, and thereby grant them a time of repenting. Thus it becomes a Christian judge to act in the cause of the Church, at our request, at our admonition, at our intercession. Other men are wont to appeal from the mildness of the sentence, when their enemies are too favourably dealt with upon conviction: but we so love our enemies, that, if we did not presume upon your Christian obedience, we should appeal from the severity of your sentence."

After this manner St. Austin always pleads for favour to be shewed to the Donatists, that they should not be prosecuted unto blood, in the cause of the Church, though it were for a capital crime, which, in a civil case, would infallibly have been punished with death, without redemption. And certainly they, who were so tender of their enemies' lives, when they were guilty of such flagrant crimes of violent outrages against the Church, could never think it lawful to sentence them to death for mere error in opinion. And, therefore, though Honorius made some such laws, after St. Austin had written all this, yet we never find the Church approved them, or desired they should be put in execution: but, on the contrary, always stood firm to her own character, which we have heard before in the words of St. Austin; that is, That no good men in the Catholic Church were pleased with having heretics prosecuted unto death. Lesser punishments, they thought, might have their use, as means, sometimes, to bring them to consideration and re-

Illi scelere immani membra de corpore vivo avulserunt; tu opere misericordie effice, ut illa, quæ nefandis operibus exercebant, alicui utili operi integra eorum membra deserviant. Illi non pepercerunt correctionem sibi prædicantibus Dei servis: tu parce comprehensis, parce ductis, parce convictis. Illi impio ferro fuderunt sanguinem Christianum: tu ab eorum sanguine etiam juridicum gladium cohibe propter Christum. Illi ministro ecclesiæ occiso extorserunt spatium vivendi: tu inimicis ecclesiæ viventibus relaxa spatium pœnitendi. Talem te oportet esse in causa ecclesiæ judicem Christianum, petentibus, monentibus, intercedentibus nobis. Solent homines, quando cum inimicis eorum convictis lenius agitur, a mitiore sententia provocare. Sed inimicos nostros ita diligimus, ut, nisi de tua Christiana obedientia præsumamus, a tua severa sententia provocemus.

penitance: but to take away their lives was to deprive them, at once, of all means and opportunity of repenting. Besides that it was invidious to the Church, and rather a confirmation to heresy: for such as were slain, were always reckoned martyrs by their party. Thus the Donatists honoured their Circumcellions, which were slain in the encounter with Macarius, whom the Emperor Constans sent into Afric, in a peaceable manner, to scatter his gifts among them, and try to reduce them to unity by his kindness: they were the aggressors, and forced him to require aid of the governors to defend himself against their assaults: and yet those that were slain in so necessary defence, were by them reputed martyrs, and the Catholics were nicknamed Macarians, and these called the 'Macarian days;' that is, in their language, days of persecution. And, in answer to this, Optatus was forced to tell them,^d 1. That the fact was false: no violence was used toward them; there was no terror in the first design; they neither felt rod, nor imprisonment, but only exhortations to peace. And, 2. If any violence was offered to them, they called it upon themselves by their own insolency, obliging the emperor's officer or almoner to defend himself against the rude insults of the Circumcellions. Meanwhile whatever happened was neither

^d Optat. lib. iii. (pp. 59, 60, edit. Paris. 1679.) Ab operariis (h. e. administris) unitatis multa quidem aspere gesta sunt, sed ea ad quid imputatis Lentio, Macario, vel Taurino? imputate majoribus vestris: qui (sicut in propheta scriptum est) ut vobis stupescerent dentes, ipsi uvas acidas comederunt. Illis primo, qui populum Dei diviserunt, et basilicas fecerunt non necessarias. Deinde Donato Carthaginis, qui provocavit, ut unitas proximo tempore fieri tentaretur. Tertio Donato Bagaïensi, qui insanam collegerat multitudinem, a qua ne Macarius violentiam pateretur, qui ad se, et ad ea, quæ ferebat tutanda, armati militis postulavit auxilium. Venerunt tunc cum pharetris armigeri, repleta est unaquæque civitas vociferantium: nuntiata unitate, fugistis omnes. Nulli dictum est, 'Nega Deum.' Nulli dictum est, 'Incende Testamentum.' Nulli dictum est, 'Aut thus pone, aut basilicas dirue.' Istæ enim res solent martyria generare. Renuntiata est unitas, sola fuerant hortamenta, ut Deus et Christus ejus, a populo in unum conveniente, pariter rogaretur. Nullus erat primitus terror. Nemo viderat virgam: nemo custodiam: sola fuerant hortamenta. Timuistis omnes, fugistis, trepidastis: ut pro certo de vobis dictum sit, quod in Psalmo scriptum est, 'Trepidaverunt, ubi non erat timor.' Fugerunt igitur omnes episcopi cum clericis suis, aliqui sunt mortui. Qui fortiores fuerunt, capti longe relegati sunt. Et tamen horum omnium nihil actum est cum voto nostro: nihil cum consilio, nihil cum conscientia, nihil cum opere. Sed gesta sunt omnia in dolore Dei, amare plorantis, &c. (Paris, 1631, p. 61.)

done by the desire, nor the counsel, nor the knowledge, nor the concurrence, of the Church. A like instance happened in the case of the Priscillianists. Priscillian and some of his accomplices were, by Maximus the emperor, at the instigation of Ithacius, a fierce and sanguinary bishop, sentenced unto death. This gave occasion to the followers of Priscillian to triumph in the sufferings of their leader: for, as Sulpicius Severus observes,^e “ His death was so far from suppressing the heresy, that it gave confirmation to it, and made it spread further than otherwise it would have done: for his followers, who before honoured him as a saint, afterwards began to reverence him as a martyr.” The thing was utterly displeasing to all good men, who were interested and attached to the Ithacian party. St. Martin, bishop of Tours, not only rebuked Ithacius for his over zealous prosecution, but interceded with Maximus the emperor to abstain from shedding their blood, telling him,^f “ It was enough to expel heretics from their Churches, after they were once condemned by the episcopal judgment:” and he obtained a promise of Maximus, not to decree any thing against their lives. From which when he departed by the persuasion of others, and condemned them to death, St. Martin would never after be induced to communicate with those sanguinary men, save once in a small matter, of which he also repented, and continued his aversion to them all his days, as the same historian informs us.^g Now from all this it is plain, that whatever favour or assistance the ancient Church required of the civil magistrates to back her discipline with against heretics or other delinquents, she never desired them to unsheath the sword in her cause, or punish them with death; but always interposed in their behalf, that they might have the favour to live and repent, if ever any sanguinary laws (which were very rare, and noways encouraged

^e Sever. Hist. lib. ii. Lugd. Bat. 1626, 154, (p. 290, edit. Lips. 1703.) Prisciliano occiso, non solum non repressa est hæresis, quæ illo auctore proruperat, sed confirmata latius propagata est. Namque sectatores ejus, qui eum prius ut sanctum honoraverant, postea ut martyrem colere cœperunt.

^f Ibid. p. 151, (p. 287, edit. cit.) Non desinebat increpare Ithacium, ut ab accusatione desisteret: Maximum orare, ut sanguine infelicium abstinere: satis superque sufficere, ut episcopali sententia hæretici judicati ecclesiis pellerentur, &c.

^g Ibid. Dialog. iii. n. xv. (c. xiii. tot. pp. 483, 484.)

or approved by the Church) were made against them. The discipline of fire and fagot, and inquisitions, and a thousand other tortures, which, under pretence of mercy, has spilt so much Christian blood, are inventions of later ages, and more corrupt and degenerate times, when men had forgot the spirit of Christianity, and the character of our blessed Lord, who “came not to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”

SECT. V.—*The Discipline of the Church deprived no Man of his Natural or Civil Rights; much less the Magistrate of his Power, or Allegiance, due to him.*

It was no part of the ancient discipline to deprive men of their natural or civil rights. A master did not lose his natural authority over his family, nor a parent over his children, by losing the privileges of Christian communion. A judge did not lose his office or charge in the state, by being cast out of the Church. For many such enjoyed their power and jurisdiction under Constantius and other heretical princes, notwithstanding the Church’s censures. Though now it is the common doctrine of the Romish Church, as Cardinal Tolet delivers it for the instruction of priests,^h “That an excommunicated person cannot exercise any act of jurisdiction without sin; nay, and if his excommunication be made public, all his sentences are null and of no effect.” This rule is designed against sovereign powers, to weaken the hands of princes, by displacing their officers, under pretence of excommunication. But the Church of Rome goes further, and puts it in the power of the pope to lay princes under the highest excommunication, or anathema; and then, by virtue of that, to depose them from their thrones, and absolve subjects from their allegiance, and dispose of their kingdoms to whom they think fit. Of which practice there is not the least footstep in all the discipline of the Primitive Church for many ages, nor scarce any unquestionable

^h Tolet. de Instruct. Sacerdot. lib. i. c. iii. Excommunicatus non potest exercere actum jurisdictionis absque peccatis: immo si publica est excommunicatio facta, sententiæ nullæ sunt.—Du Moulin’s Buckler of Faith, p. 370. — Decret. Gregor. lib. ii. tit. xxvii. de Sentent. et Re Judic. c. xxiv.

instance of such attempt before the time of Pope Hildebrand, or Gregory VII. (from whom this doctrine is called the Hildebrandine doctrine), as some of their own historians ingenuously confess. "I have read over and over again," says Otho Frisingensis, a noble German bishop,¹ "the records of the Roman kings and emperors; and I nowhere find that any of them, before this, was excommunicated, or deprived of his kingdom by the bishop of Rome; unless any one think fit to call that anathematizing, when Philip the emperor was placed among the penitents for a little time by the Roman bishop; or when Theodosius, for his cruel slaughter of the Thessalonians, was debarred from entering the church, by St. Ambrose." There is no question but that princes anciently were sometimes denied the communion, as St. Ambrose denied Theodosius: but as that was not properly putting them under the great excommunication or anathema, so much less was it depriving them of their legal power and dominion. Constantius was a heretic, and Julian an apostate; Valens and Valentinian the younger were professed Arians; Anastasius and many others, abettors and propugners of several heresies; yet the Church never pretended to withdraw her allegiance from them, or depose them: neither was this for want of power, as Bellarmine and others commonly pretend, but for want of just authority and right: for the Church, in those days, knew nothing either of a direct or indirect power, that the pope, or any other bishop, had over the temporal rights of princes; but professed obedience to them, whether they were heathen or heretics; in the Church, or out of the Church; persecutors, or friends: as the reader that pleases, may see more fully demonstrated in the elaborate work of our learned Bishop Buckridge, in defence of Barclay against Bellarmine,² concerning the pretended power

¹ Otho Frising. lib. vi. c. xxxv. *Lego et relego Romanorum regum et imperatorum gesta; et nusquam invenio quemquam eorum ante hunc a Romano pontifice excommunicatum, vel regno privatum, nisi quis forte pro anathemate habendum ducat, quod Philippus ad breve tempus a Romano episcopo inter penitentes collocatus; et Theodosius a beato Ambrosio propter cruentam cædem a liminibus ecclesiæ sequestratus sit.*

² Joan. Roffen. de Potestate Papæ in Rebus Temporalibus, &c. Lond. 1614, lib. ii. c. x.

of the pope in temporals, and his usurpation of a right to dethrone princes; where, among many other unanswerable arguments, he confirms the forementioned observation of Otho Frisingensis, "That Hildebrand was the first that put this wicked doctrine in practice against the Emperor Henry IV., from the concurrent testimony of almost twenty writers of the Roman communion." I shall pursue this matter no further here, having said what is sufficient to confirm this remark about the discipline of the Church, that it deprived no man of his natural or civil rights, much less gave any one authority to dethrone princes, or absolve subjects from their allegiance, or dispose of their kingdoms, under pretence of setting up the spiritual sword above the temporal.

SECT. VI. — *But consisted, First, in Admonition of the Offender.*

But the discipline of the Church, being a mere spiritual power, was confined to these following acts: 1. The admonition of the offender: which was solemnly repeated once or twice commonly, before they proceeded to greater severities, according to that of the apostle: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." After this manner, St. Ambrose represents their proceedings:¹ "A putrefied member of the body is never cut off but with grief: we try a long time whether it cannot be healed with medicines; if not, then a good physician cuts it off. Such is the affection of a good bishop; he is very desirous, first, to heal the infirm, to put a stop to growing ulcers, to burn and sear a little, and not cut off: at last he cuts off, with grief, what cannot be healed." So Prosper says,^m "They that being long endured, and often kindly admonished, will not be

¹ Ambros. de Offic. lib. ii. c. xxvii. Cum dolore amputatur etiam, quæ putruit pars corporis, et diu tractatur, si potest sanari medicamentis: si non potest, tunc a medico bono absciditur. Sic episcopi adfectus boni est, ut optet sanare infirmos, serpentia auferre ulcera, adurere aliqua, non abscidere: postremo quod sanari non potest, cum dolore abscindere. (Paris. 1836, vol. iii. p. 198.)

^m Prosper. de Vit. Contemplat. lib. ii. c. vii. Qui diu portati et salubriter objurgati, corrigi noluerunt, tamquam putres corporis partes debent ferro excommunicationis abscidi. (Venet. 1782, vol. ii. p. 20.)

corrected, are cut off as putrefied members, with the sword of excommunication."

And thus Synesius represents his own proceedings against Andronicus, the tyrannical governor of Ptolemais, who made use of his power only to oppress and vex the people. He first tried whether admonitions and remonstrances against his cruelty would work upon him :ⁿ but when they proved ineffectual, and the man grew more outrageous and incorrigible, breaking out into that blasphemous expression, "That in vain did any man hope for succour from the Church; and that no man should escape his hands, although he laid hold of the foot of Christ himself;" "after this," says Synesius,^o "he was no longer to be admonished, but cut off as an incurable member, for fear the sound parts should be corrupted by his society and contagion." And so he proceeded to pronounce that formal excommunication against him, which we shall hear more of by and by.

SECT. VII.—*Secondly, in Suspension from the Communion, called 'the Lesser Excommunication.'*

Some call this the *προβесμία*, 'the warning,' or 'time given them to repent,'^p which was limited sometimes to the space of ten days :^q after which, if they continued obstinate and refractory, the Church proceeded to greater severities,

ⁿ Synes. Ep. lvii. fere tot.

^o Ibid. Ep. lviii. (p. 202, edit. Paris. 1633.) Οὐκίτι νοθεύεις ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ', ὥσπερ μίλος ἀνάσταις ἔχον, ἀποκοπείς ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῷ ὑγιαίνειν συμβέβηται.

^p Habert. Archierat. p. 739, ex Epist. Joan. Antioch. ad Nestorium. Tempus illud *προβесμία* dicitur. Conquerebatur Nestorius angustum esse ad deliberandum tempus : at Joannes Antiochenus Epistola ad Nestorium apposite reponit, Καὶ γὰρ εἰ καὶ *προβесμία*ν σπινωτάτην τοῖς γράμμασιν ἐνέθηκε ὁ κύριός μου, ὁ Θεοφιλέστατος Κελεσίτινος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, δίκαια μόναις ἡμέραις περιερίσας τὴν ἀπόκρισιν· ἀλλ' ἔβριστιν ἔργον αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι καὶ ἡμέρας μόνης μῆας, τάχα δὲ καὶ ὥρων ἐλγῶν. (Labbe. iii. 390.)

^q Celestin. Epist. ad Nestor. (tom. iii. Conc. p. 362, E.) Φανερώς τοῖσιν Ἰσθι, ταύτην ἡμῶν εἶναι τὴν ἀπόφασιν, ὡς ἰὰν μὴ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ταῦτα κηρύξῃς, ἅπτε καὶ ἡ Ῥωμαίων, καὶ ἡ Ἀλιξανδρίων, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία κατ'ἐχτι, ὡς καὶ ἡ ἀγία ἡ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Κωνσταντινουπόλιν ἐκκλησία ἰως σου κάλλιστα κατ'ἐχτι· καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἀπιστον καινότητα, ἥτις ἐπιχειρεῖ χωρεῖζιν, ἅπτε συνάπτῃ ἡ ἀγία γραφὴ, ἐντὸς δεκάτης ἡμέρας, ἀριθμουμένης ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης τῆς ὑπομνήσεως, φανερῶ καὶ ἰγγραφεῖ ὁμολογίᾳ ἀντιθέσης, ἀπὸ πάσης κοινωνίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβέβησαι.

to deny them communion by the lesser or greater excommunication. The lesser excommunication was commonly called ἀφορισμός, 'separation,' or 'suspension:' and it consisted in excluding men from the participation of the eucharist, and prayers of the faithful; but did not expel them the church: for still they might stay to hear the psalmody and reading of the Scriptures, and the sermon, and the prayers of the catechumens and the penitents, and then depart with them, when that first service, called 'the service of the catechumens,' was ended. Theodoret expressly distinguishes this lesser excommunication from the greater, when speaking of some who had lapsed into sin rather by infirmity than maliciousness, he says,^r "They should be debarred from partaking of the holy mysteries, but not debarred from the prayers or service of the catechumens." And thus we are to understand that canon of Gregory Thaumaturgus,^s which orders such to be excommunicated from prayers, as detained the goods of their brethren (which they had lost in the invasion of the barbarians), under pretence of having found them. 'Prayers' there, means the prayers of the faithful at the altar, or the communion-service, from which they were suspended, and not the prayers of the catechumens, at which they might be present, notwithstanding their suspension from the other. So that this was a lower degree of punishment, excluding them in part only from the society of the faithful, that is, from the common prayers and the eucharist, but not totally expelling them the church. And it was commonly inflicted for lesser crimes; or if for greater, upon such sinners only as shewed immediately a ready disposition to submit to the laws of repentance: there being something in their forward-

^r Theodoret. Epist. lxxvii. ad Eulalium, (tom. iii. p. 947.) Κωλύεισθαι μὲν τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων, μὴ κωλύεισθαι δὲ τῆς τῶν κατηχουμένων εὐχῆς, μηδὲ τῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀκροάσεως, μηδὲ τῆς τῶν διδασκάλων παρατίσεως. (Hal. 1772, tom. iv. p. 1130.)

^s Gregor. Thaum. c. v. (apud Labb. tom. i. Conc. p. 840.) "Ἄλλοι δὲ ἑαυτοὺς ἑκαπατῶσι, ἐντὶ τῶν ἰδίων τῶν ἀπολλυμένων, ἃ εὖρον ἀλλότρια κατήχοντες . . . οὕς δι' ἐκκληρῆσαι τῶν εὐχῶν. — Conc. Ilerdens. c. iv. De his, qui se incesta pollutione commaculant, placuit, ut, quousque in ipso detestando et illicito carnis contubernio perseverant, usque ad missam tantum catechumenorum in ecclesia admittantur. (Labb. iv. p. 1611.)

ness to entitle them to a more favourable sentence. The Council of Eliberis[†] orders this sort of abstention from the eucharist for three weeks, to be inflicted on those who, without any necessary avocation, neglected to come to church for three Lord's-days together. And in another canon[‡] suspends such virgins for a year, as were guilty of antenuptial fornication; ordering them to be received again without public penance, provided they were married to the persons by whom they were defiled, living chastely with them for the future. Albaspinæus here rightly observes,[¶] "That this was only depriving them of the eucharist; for they were neither expelled the church, nor obliged to go through any of the stages of public penance, but might pray with the catechumens, and with the faithful also; only they were not allowed to participate of the holy mysteries till their term was expired; and therein their punishment consisted." St. Basil's canons^{*} speak of the same punishment for trigamists, or 'persons that were married a third time.' They were to be under penance for five years; half the time to be hearers only, and half the time co-standers; that is, they might stay to hear the prayers of the faithful, but not partake

[†] Conc. Illiber. c. xxi. Si quis in civitate positus, tres Dominicas ad ecclesiam non accesserit, [pauc]o tanto tempore abstineat, ut correptus esse videatur.

[‡] Ibid. c. xiv. Virgines, quæ virginitatem suam non custodierint, si eosdem, qui eas violaverint, duxerint et tenuerint maritos; eo quod solas nuptias violaverint, post annum, sine pœnitentia, reconciliari debebunt. (Labbi. i.)

[¶] Albaspin. in loc. 'Sine pœnitentia,' non hoc ita accipiendum, quasi velint eas absque sacramento pœnitentiæ absolvendas esse, aut statuant ejusmodi peccatum non esse aliqua pœna coercendum, vel denique eis non esse dolendum de stupro: sed 'pœnitentia' hoc loco intelliguntur pœnæ et ærumnæ, quæ in gradibus pœnitentiæ palam et publice caperentur, quæ quum pudorem aliquem sugillarent, non erant ejusmodi virginibus infligendæ. Quid autem sit, 'post annum sine pœnitentiâ reconciliari,' quodve genus pœnarum ex hoc canone, et ex vigesimo primo colligitur? levia quædam crimina hac pœna mulctabantur, quæ in eo versaretur, ut ab eucharistia arcerentur: mihi que persuasum est, eos qui levi illa animadversione castigabantur, non aliter orasse aut stetisse in ecclesia, neque aliter habitos, quam subsistentes, et omnibus rebus divinis et humanis participasse cum ceteris fidelibus, præterquam eucharistiæ. (P. 992.)

^{*} Basil. c. iv. Συνήθειαν κατελάβομεν, ἰπὶ τῶν τριγάμων πινταστίας ἀφορισμόν . . διὸ δὲ μὴ πάντῃ αὐτοὺς ἀπείργειν τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ἀλλ' ἀκροάσεις αὐτοὺς ἄξιον ἐν δύο που ἔτισιν ἢ τρισὶ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἱπυτρίταιν συστήκειν μὲν, τῆς δὲ κοινωνίας τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀπὶχίσθαι, καὶ οὕτως ἰπιδιξαμένους καρπὸν τινα μετανοίας ἀποκαθίστην τῇ τόπῃ τῆς κοινωνίας.

of the communion with them. So that here were two degrees of this lesser excommunication; the one excluding them only from the eucharist, but allowing them to pray with the faithful; and the other, excluding them from the prayers of the faithful, and only allowing them to pray with the catechumens; but neither of them expelling such delinquents totally from the communion of the Church.

SECT. VIII. — *Thirdly, In Expulsion from the Church, called 'the Greater Excommunication,' 'Total Separation,' 'Anathema,' and the like.*

The greater excommunication was, when men were totally expelled the Church, and separated from all communion in holy offices with her. Whence, in the ancient canons, it is distinguished by the names of παντελής ἀφορισμός, 'the total separation; and anathema,' 'the curse:' it being the greatest curse that could be laid upon man. It is frequently, also, signified by the several terms and phrases of, ἀπείργεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀποκλείεσθαι, and ῥίπτεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐκτὸς εἶναι, ἐκκληρεῖσθαι τῆς συνόδου, ἀπείρξαι τῆς ἀκροάσεως, &c. All which denote men's being wholly cast out of the Church, by the most formal excommunication, and debarred not only from the eucharist, but from the prayers, and hearing the Scriptures in any assembly of the Church. This form is elegantly expressed by Synesius, with all the appendages and consequences of it, in his excommunication of Andronicus, mentioned before, in these words; 'Now that the man is no longer to be admonished, but cut off as an incurable member, the Church of Ptolemais makes this declaration or injunction, to all her sister-Churches throughout the world: 'Let no Church of God be open to Andronicus and his accomplices; to Thoas and his accomplices; but let every sacred temple and sanctuary be shut against them. The devil has no part in Paradise; though he privily creep in, he is driven

† Synes. Ep. lviii. p. 199. 'Ἀνδρονίκῳ, καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ, μηδὲν ἀνοιγνύσθω τίμιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅπας αὐτοῖς ἱεὺς ἀποκλείεσθω, καὶ σηκὸς καὶ περίβολος. οὐκ ἔστι τῷ διαβόλῳ μέρος ἐν παραδείσῳ· ὃς καὶ λάθῃ διαδύς, ἔξειλαύνεται. παραινῶ μὲν οὖν καὶ βιώτῃ παντὶ καὶ ἄρχοντι, μήτι ἄμορφον αὐτῷ, μήτι ἄμορφαπίζον γίνισθαι ἱερεῖσι δὲ διαφειρόντως, οἳ μήτι ζῶντας αὐτοὺς προσερεῶσι, μήτι τιλινη-

out again.' I therefore admonish both private men and magistrates, neither to receive them under their roof nor to their table; and priests, more especially, that they neither converse with them living, nor attend their funerals when dead. And if any one despise this Church, as being only a small city, and receive those that are excommunicated by her, as if there was no necessity of observing the rules of a poor Church; let them know, that they divide the Church by schism, which Christ would have to be one. And whoever does so, whether he be Levite, presbyter, or bishop, shall be ranked in the same class with Andronicus: we will neither give them the right hand of fellowship, nor eat at the same table with them; and much less will we communicate in the sacred mysteries with them who choose to have part with Andronicus and Thoas." I have recited this whole form, not only because it is curiously drawn up by an excellent pen, but also because it opens the way into the further knowledge of the discipline of the Church. For here we may observe four things, as concomitants, or immediate consequents, of this greater excommunication. 1. That casting out of the Church, is represented under the image of casting out of Paradise, and paralleled with it, in the form of excommunication. 2. That as soon as any one was struck out of the list of his own Church, notice was given thereof to the neighbouring Churches, and sometimes to the Churches over all the world, that all Churches might confirm and ratify this act of discipline, by refusing to admit such a one to their communion. Forasmuch as that, 3. He that was legally excommunicated in one Church, was, by the laws of Catholic unity, and rules of right discipline, to be held excommunicate in all Churches, till he had given just and reasonable satisfaction: and for any Church to receive such a one into her communion, was so great an offence, as to be thought to

σαντας συμπροσίμψουσιν. εἰ δὲ τις ὡς μητροπολίτιν ἀποσκυβαλίσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ διέξεται τοὺς ἀποκηρύκτους αὐτῆς, ὡς οὐκ ἀνάγκη τῇ πίνητι πείσθαι· ἴστω σχίσας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἣν μίαν ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι βούλεται. ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος, εἴτε Λευίτης ἴσταιν, εἴτε πρεσβύτερος, εἴτε ἐπίσκοπος, παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν Ἀνδρονίκου μίσησιν τιτάσσεται, καὶ οὐτε ἐμμελοῦμεν αὐτῷ διέξαιν, οὐτε ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ποτι σιτησόμεθα· πολλοὺ δὲ διήσομεν κοινοῖναι τῆς ἀπορρήτου τιλιτῆς τοῖς ἐθιλήσασιν ἔχυν μερίδα μετὰ Ἀνδρονίκου καὶ Θόαντος. (Paris. 1633, p. 203, A.)

deserve the same punishment with the offending criminal. 4. That when men were thus excommunicated, they were not only excluded from communion in sacred things, but shunned and avoided in civil conversation, as dangerous and infected persons. All these things are evident from this single passage of Synesius; but because the knowledge of the manner of exercising ecclesiastical discipline, depends upon the truth of them, it will not be amiss a little more distinctly to explain and confirm them. First, then, I observe, that casting out of the Church is here represented under the image of Paradise, and paralleled with it in the form of excommunication. And so it is said by St. Jerom,^a “That sinners transgress the covenant of God in the Church, as Adam did in Paradise: and shew themselves followers of their first Father, that they may be cast out of the Church, as he was out of Paradise.” In like manner, St. Austin, speaking of Adam’s expulsion out of Paradise, says,^a “It was a sort of excommunication: as now in our Paradise, that is, the Church, men, by ecclesiastical discipline, are removed from the visible sacraments of the altar.” And Epiphanius notes the same custom, as more nicely observed by the sect of the Adamians:^b “For if any one was taken in a crime, they would not suffer him to come into their assembly, but called him Adam, ‘the eater of the forbidden fruit;’ and adjudged him to be expelled, as out of Paradise, that is, their Church.” So that this was a common form, or phrase, both in the discipline of heretics and the Church.

^a Hieron. Comm. in Hoseam, c. vi. *Prævaricati sunt pactum Dei in ecclesia, sicut Adam prævaricatus est in paradiso: et imitatores se antiqui parentis ostendunt, ut quomodo ille de paradiso, sic et isti ejicientur.*

^a Aug. de Genesi, ad litt. lib. xi. c. xl. tom. iii. p. 273, (p. 676, edit. Basil. 1569.) *Alienandus erat, tamquam excommunicatus: sicut etiam in hoc paradiso, id est ecclesia, solent a sacramentis altaris visibilibus homines disciplina ecclesiastica removeri.* (Vol. iii. part i. p. 221, A. 8, 1700.)

^b Epiphan. Hæres. lii. *Εἰ δὲ δόξῃς, τινὰ, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο λέγουσιν, ἐν παραπτώματι γινίσθαι, οὐκίτι τοῦτον συνάγουσι. φάσκουσι γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀδὰμ τὸν βιβρακόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, καὶ κρίνουσιν ἐξιῶσθαι, ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Παραδείσου, τουτίστι τῆς αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας.* (Paris. 1622, vol. i. p. 459, C. 8.)

SECT. IX. — *This Sort of Excommunication was commonly notified to all other Churches.*

Secondly, I observe, that as soon as any one was, in this manner, excommunicated by any Church, notice thereof was commonly given to other Churches, and sometimes by circular letters to all eminent Churches over all the world, that all Churches might confirm and ratify this act of discipline, by refusing to admit such a one to their communion. To this purpose we find a canon in the first Council of Toledo,^c “That if any powerful man oppress and spoil a clerk, or a poor man, or one of a religious life, and a bishop summon him before him, to have a trial, and he refuses to obey the summons; in that case he shall give notice, by letter, to all the bishops of the province, and to as many as possibly he can, that such a one be held excommunicate, till he obediently submits, and makes restitution.” This was, usually, most punctually observed in the case of heretics, and their condemnation: for so the historians tell us,^d when Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, had deposed and anathematized Arius, he sent his circular letters to all Churches, giving an account of his proceedings against him. And this was the constant practice in all councils, to send about their synodical letters, to signify what heretics they condemned, that all Churches might be apprised of their errors, and refuse their communion to the authors of them: and thus every bishop was careful to inform his brethren and neighbouring Churches, whenever he had occasion to use this severe punishment against any offender. Thus St. Austin, having deposed Victorinus, an aged subdeacon, and expelled him the Church, because he was found hypocritically, in private, to have propagated the abominable heresies of the Mani-

^c Conc. Tolet. I. c. xi. Si quis de potentibus clericum, aut quemlibet pauperem, aut religiosum exspoliaverit, et mandaverit eum ad se venire episcopus, ut audiat, et is contemserit; invicem mox scripta percurrant per omnes provinciae episcopos, et quoscumque adire potuerint, ut excommunicatus habeatur ipse, donec obediat et reddat aliena. (Labbe. ii. p. 1225.)

^d Socrat. lib. i. c. vi. (Vales. p. 9.) Συνίδριον πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων καθίσας, τὸν μὲν Ἄρειον καὶ τοὺς ἀποδιχαίμενους τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καθαιρεῖν· γράψαι δὲ τοῖς κατὰ πόλιν τοιαύτη, κ. τ. λ. — Theodoret. lib. i. c. iv. tot.

chees, writes to Deuterius, one of his fellow-bishops, and tells him,* “He did not think it sufficient to have used this congruous ecclesiastical severity against him, unless he also gave intimation of what he had done against him, that every one, being well apprized, might know how to be aware of him.”

SECT. X.—*After which, he that was excommunicated in one Church, was held excommunicate in all Churches.*

Then, thirdly, whoever was thus excommunicated in one Church, was held excommunicate in all Churches. For such was the perfect harmony and agreement of the Catholic Church, that every Church was ready to ratify and confirm all acts of discipline exercised upon delinquents in any other Church: so that he who was legally excommunicated in one Church, was, by the laws of Catholic unity, and rules of right discipline, held excommunicate in all Churches; and no Church could or would receive him into communion, before he had given satisfaction to the Church whereof he was a member: and to do otherwise was to incur the same penalty that was inflicted upon the offending party. I have given some evidence of this before,^f in speaking of the unity of the Church: and here I shall a little further confirm it, to shew the exactness of the ancient Church in the administration of discipline, both from her laws and practice. Her laws are altogether uniform upon this point, and run universally in this tenour, that no person excommunicated in one Church should be received in another, except it were by the authority of a legal synod, to which there lay a just appeal, and which was allowed to judge in the case. There are two canons, among those called ‘apostolical,’ to this purpose: † “If any presbyter or deacon is suspended from

* Aug. Epist. lxxiv. ad Deuterium. Rogavit me quidem, posteaquam se Manichæorum auditorem esse confessus est, ut eum in viam veritatis doctrinæ Catholicæ revocarem. Sed fateor ejus fictionem sub clerici specie vehementer exhorui, eumque coercitum pellendum de civitate curavi. Nec mihi hoc satis fuit, nisi et tuæ sanctitati eum meis litteris intimarem, ut a clericorum gradu congrue ecclesiastica severitate dejectus, cavendus omnibus innotescat. (ii. 643.)

^f Chap. i. sect. xi. p. 415.

† Can. Apost. c. xxxiii. Labb. vol. i. p. 32, Εἰ τις πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος,

communion by his bishop, he shall not be received by any other but the bishop that suspended him, except in case the bishop chance to die that suspended him." And, again: ^h "If any clergyman or layman, who is cast out of the Church, be received in another city without commendatory letters, both he that received him and he that is so received shall be cast out of communion." The Council of Nice is supposed to refer to these ancient canons when it says, ⁱ "The rule shall stand good according to the canon which says, 'He that is cast out by one bishop, shall not be received by another; but synods shall be held twice a-year, to examine whether any one person was excommunicated unjustly, by the hasty passion, or contention, or any such irregular commotion, of his bishop; and if it appear that he was excommunicated with reason, he shall be held excommunicate by all other bishops, till the synod thinks fit to shew him favour.'" The Council of Antioch, not long after, renewed this canon: ^j "If any one is excommunicated by his own bishop, he shall not be received by any other but the bishop that excommunicated him; unless upon appeal to the synod he give satisfaction, and receive another sentence from the synod." The learned reader may find many other

ὡπὸ ἐπισκόπου γίνεται ἐν ἀφορισμῷ, τοῦτον μὴ ἐξίεναι παρ' ἑτέρου διχθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἢ παρὰ τοῦ ἀφορίζαντος αὐτόν, εἰ μὴ ἂν κατὰ συγκυρίαν τελευτήσῃ ὁ ἀφορίζας αὐτὸν ἐπίσκοπος.

^h Can. Apost. c. xiii. (xii.) Εἴ τις κληρικὸς, ἢ λαϊκὸς, ἀφορισμένος, ἢ τοι ἄδικτος, ἀπειλὸν ἐν ἑτέρῃ πόλει διχθῆναι ἄντι γραμμάτων συστατικῶν, ἀφορίζεσθαι οἱ διέξομαι καὶ ὁ διχθείς. (P. 28.)

ⁱ Conc. Nic. c. v. vol. ii. p. 237. Περὶ τῶν ἀποιωνήτων γινώσκων, εἴτε τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, εἴτε τῶν ἐν τῷ λαῖκῳ τάγματι, ὑπὸ τῶν καθ' ἐκαστὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων, κρατέτω ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα, [τὸν διαγορεύοντα,] τοὺς ὅφ' ἑτέρον ἀποκληθέντας, ὅφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίσθαι ἐξιστάσθαι δὲ, μὴ μικροψυχίᾳ, ἢ φιλονικίᾳ, ἢ τινι ταυῦν ἀηδίᾳ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἀποσυνάγωγῃ γιγνίσσεται ἵνα οὖν ταῦτο τὴν πρίσταν ἐξίσταν λαμβάνη, καλῶς ἔχῃν ἰδεῖν, ἐκαστοῦ ἵκανοῦ καθ' ἐκαστὴν ἐπαρχίαν δις τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι ἵνα κοινῇ πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομῇν, τὰ ταυῦτα ζητήματα ἐξιστάσθαι καὶ οὕτως οἱ ὁμολογουμένως προσκειρομένους τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, κατὰ λόγον ἀκωνώνηται παρὰ πᾶσιν (πάντων) εἶναι δόξαι, μέλει δὲ τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἐπισκόπων [ἢ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ] δόξῃ, τὴν φιλανθρωποσίαν ὡς [ἐπὶ] αὐτῶν ἐκίσθαι ψῆφον.

^j Conc. Antioch. c. vi. Εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου ἀκωνώνητος γίγεται, μὴ πρότερον αὐτὸν παρ' ἑτέρων διχθῆναι, εἰ μὴ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ παραδιχθείη τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, ἢ συνόδου γινώσκων ἀπαντήσας ἀπολογήσεται, πείσας τε τὴν σύνοδον, καταδιξάντο ἑτέραν ἀπόφασιν. (Labbe. ii. 564.)

canons, to the same purpose, in the Councils of Eliberis,^k and Sardica,^l and Milevis,^m and the first of Arles,ⁿ and Turin,^o and Saragossa,^p which all run in the same tenour, and need not here be repeated. It was by this rule and principle that Cornelius refused to admit Felicissimus to communion at Rome,^q because he had been excommunicated by Cyprian at Carthage. And for the same reason Marcion, as has been noted before, could find no reception among the Roman clergy, because he was excommunicated by his own father, and had given no satisfaction to him, as Epiphanius^r

^k Conc. Illiber. c. liii. vol. i. p. 976. Placuit cunctis, ut ab eo episcopo quis accipiat communionem, a quo abstentus in crimine aliquo fuerit. Quod si alius episcopus præsumserit eum admittere, illo adhuc minime faciente, vel consentiente, a quo fuerat communione privatus, sciat se hujusmodi causas inter fratres cum status sui periculo præstaturum.

^l Conc. Sardic. c. xiii. Καὶ τοῦτο πᾶσιν ἀρεσάτω, ἵνα εἴ τις διάκονος, ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, ἢ καὶ τις τῶν κληρικῶν ἀκοινωνήτος γίνηται, καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν εἰδὼτα αὐτὸν καταθύγοι, γινώσκοντα ἀποκικινῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς κοινωνίας παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, μὴ χρεῖναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ὑβρεῖ ποιοῦντα παρέχειν αὐτῷ κοινωνίαν· εἰ δὲ τελέμησιν τις τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, γινώσκίτω συνιλλόντων ἐπισκόπων ἀπολογία αὐτὸν ὑπεύθυνον καθιστάναι. (Labb. ii. 637.)

^m Conc. Milevit. c. xviii. Placuit, ut quicumque non communicat in provincia propria, et in aliis provinciis vel transmarinis partibus ad communicandum obreperit, jacturam communionis vel clericatus excipiat. (ii. 1542.)

ⁿ Conc. Arelat. I. c. xvi. De his, qui pro delicto suo a communione separantur, placuit, ut, in quibuscumque locis fuerint exclusi, eodem loco communionem consequantur. (i. 1428.)

^o Conc. Taurin. c. iv. vol. ii. p. 1156. De Palladio laico, qui Spano presbytero non leve crimen intenderat, inter quos episcopus Triferius ejusdem criminis causas se cognovisse testatus est, id concilii decrevit auctoritas, ut idem Palladius in eadem sententia maneret, qua cognitionis tempore a Triferio fuerat sacerdote multatus, in hoc ei humanitate reservata concilii, ut ipse Triferius in potestate habeat, quando voluerit, ei relaxare.

^p Conc. Cæsar-Aug. c. v. Item lectum est, ut hi, qui per disciplinam, aut sententiam episcopi ab ecclesia fuerint separati, ab aliis episcopis non sint recipiendi. (ii. 1010.)

^q Cyprian. Epist. lv. al. lix. ad Cornel. 1682, p. 126, (p. 259, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Legi litteras tuas, frater carissime, quas per Saturnum fratrem nostrum Acoluthum misisti, et dilectionis fraternæ, et ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ, et sacerdotalis censuræ satis plenas; quibus significasti, Felicissimum hostem Christi, non novum, sed jam pridem ob crimina sua plurima et gravissima abstentum, et non tantum mea, sed plurimorum coëpiscoporum sententia condemnatum, rejectum a te illic esse: et quum venisset stipatus caterva et factione desperatorum, vigore pleno, quo episcopos agere oportet, pulsum de ecclesia esse, &c.

^r Epiphani. Hæres. xlii. See chap. i. sect. xi. note (*).

relates the story. St. Austin, likewise, writing to one Quin-
tian,^a who lay under the censure of his bishop, tells him,
“ That if he came to him, not communicating with his own
bishop, he could not be received to communion with him.”
Nay, he had such a regard for this rule of discipline, that if
a Donatist that was under censure among his own bishops,
pretended to come over to the Catholic Church,^t he would
not receive him without first obliging him to do the same
penance that he should have done had he stayed among
them. And he greatly complains of the Donatist bishops, as
dissolving all the bands of discipline, whilst they encouraged
the greatest criminals, who were under discipline for their
ill lives in the Church, to come over to them, where they
might escape doing penance, under pretence of receiving a
new baptism: and then, as if they were renewed and sanc-
tified (though they were really made worse under pretence of
new grace), they could insult the discipline of the Church
from which they fled, to the highest degree of sacrilegious
madness. He gives an instance in one, who, being used to
beat his mother, and threatening to kill her, was in danger
of falling under the discipline of the Church for these his
insolent and unnatural cruelties; to avoid this he goes over
to the Donatists, who, without any more ado,^u rebaptize him
in his madness, and put on him the ‘white garment,’ or *albe*
of baptism, whilst he was fuming and thirsting after his
mother’s blood. So this man, who was meditating murder
against his own mother, was by this means advanced to an

^a Aug. Ep. C. cxxxv. Si ad nos venires, venerabili episcopo non communi-
cans, nec apud nos posses communicare. (1700, ii. p. 115, C. 4.)

^t Ibid. Epist. clxix. ad Euseb. Ego istum modum servo, ut quisquis apud eos
propter disciplinam degradatus ad Catholicam transire voluerit, in humiliatione
poenitentiae recipiatur, quo et ipsi eum forsitan cogerent, si apud eos remanere
voluisset. Ab eis vero, considera, quæso te, quam execrabiliter fiat, ut, quos
male viventes ecclesiastica disciplina corripimus, persuadeatur eis, ut ad alterum
lavacrum veniant. — Deinde quasi renovati et quasi sanctificati, disciplinæ, quam
ferre non potuerunt, deteriores facti sub specie novæ gratiæ, sacrilegio novi furoris
insultant. (Vol. ii. p. 51, C.)

^u Ibid. Epist. clxviii. ad Euseb. Transit ad partem Donati, rebaptizatur
furens, et in matrum sanguinem fremens albis vestibus candidatur. Consti-
tuitur intra cancellos eminens et conspicuus, et omnium gentium oculis matri-
cidii meditator tamquam renovatus opponitur. (Vol. ii. p. 49, D.)

eminent and conspicuous place within the chancel, and set as a sanctified creature before the eyes of all, who could not look upon him but with sighing and mourning. The truth is, this was a very scandalous practice in the Donatists, done purely to strengthen their party: and nothing has done more mischief to the Church, or more enervated the power of ecclesiastical discipline, than the receiving of scandalous sinners, who fly from justice and the censures of the Church, into other communions, and their protecting, and even caressing them as saints who ought to have been punished as the greatest criminals. Upon this account the Church went as far as possibly she could, in making severe laws to discourage this practice; inflicting the same penalty upon any one that received an excommunicate person into public or private communion, as the excommunicated person himself was liable to. Thus, in the Council of Antioch, one canon says,^x “ If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, communicate with an excommunicated person, he himself shall be excommunicated, as one that confounds the order of the Church.” Another:^y “ If any bishop receives a presbyter or deacon, deposed for contumacy by his own bishop, he shall be censured by a synod, as one that dissolves the laws of the Church.” And a third canon says,^z “ If any bishop, deposed by a synod, or presbyter or deacon, deposed by their own bishop, presume to officiate in any part of Divine service, they shall not only be incapable of being restored, but all that communicate with them, shall be cast out of the Church; especially if they do so, after they know that sentence was

^x Conc. Antioch. c. ii. Εἰ δὲ φανίῃ τις τῶν ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, ἢ διακόνων, ἢ τις τοῦ κανόνος, τοῖς ἀκoinωτήτοις κοινωνῶν, καὶ τούτων ἀκoinώητον εἶναι, ὡς εἰ συγχίοντα τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἐκκλησίας. (Labbe. ii. 561.)

^y Ibid. c. iii. Εἰ δὲ καθαιρόμεντα διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν [nimir. διὰ τὸ ἐπιμίειν τῇ ἀταξίᾳ] δίχοιτο ἱερεὺς ἐπίσκοπος, κἀκὼν ἐπιτιμίας συγχάειν ὑπὸ κοινῆς συνόδου, ὡς παραλύοντα τοὺς θεσμούς τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικούς. (P. 564.)

^z Ibid. c. iv. Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδου καθαιρόμενός, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, τολμήσῃ τι πρᾶξαι τῆς λειτουργίας, εἴτι ὁ ἐπίσκοπος κατὰ τὴν προάγουσαν συνήθειαν, εἴ τι ὁ διάκονος· μηκέτι ἔξον εἶναι αὐτῶν, μηδ' ἐν ἱερεῖ συνόδῳ ἑλπίδα ἀποκαταστάσεως, μήτι ἀπολογίας χῶραν ἔχουσιν· ἀλλὰ δι' τοὺς κοινωνούντας αὐτῶν πάντας ἀποβάλλισθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ μαθόντες τὴν ἀπόφασιν τὴν κατὰ τῶν προειρημένων ἐξινεχθεῖσαν τολμήσαναι αὐτοῖς κοινωνεῖν. See also can. i.

pronounced against them." In like manner the first Council of Orange :^a " If any bishop presumes to communicate with one that is excommunicate, knowing him to be so, without his being reconciled to the bishop by whom he was excommunicated, he shall be treated as a guilty person." The second Council of Carthage says, more expressly,^b " That a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, who receives those into communion who were deservedly cast out of the Church for their crimes, shall be held guilty of the same crimes with them." The fourth Council of Carthage declares, universally,^c " Whoever he be, clergyman or layman, that communicates with an excommunicate person, shall himself be excommunicated." St. Basil's words are very remarkable, to an offender whom he threatened to excommunicate :^d " Thou shalt be anathema to all the people ; and whoever receives thee, shall be excommunicate in all Churches." The like may be read in the Apostolical Canons, to which the ancient councils so often refer as the standing rule of discipline :^e " If any clergyman or layman, who is cast out of the Church, be received in another city without commendatory letters, both he that receives him and he that is so received, shall be cast out of communion." Which answers an objection that might be raised in the case, viz. What, if a bishop knew not, by any formal intimation, that such or such a person was excommunicate, and so, through

^a Conc. Arausic. c. xi. Placuit in reatum venire episcopum, qui admonitus de excommunicatione cujusquam, sine reconciliatione ejus qui eum excommunicavit, ei communicare præsumerit. (Labb. iii. 1449.)

^b Conc. Carth. II. c. vii. Placuit, ut qui merito facinorum suorum ab ecclesia pulsus sunt, si ab aliquo episcopo, vel presbytero, vel clerico fuerint in communionem suscepti, etiam ipse pari cum eis crimine teneatur obnoxius. (ii. 1161.)

^c Conc. Carth. IV. c. lxxiii. Qui communicaverit vel oraverit cum excommunicato, sive clericus sive laicus, excommunicetur. (ii. 1205.)

^d Basil. can. lxxxix. (Falsa allegatio. Habentur tantum lxxxv. canones ap. Basil. tom. iii. p. 40, et ap. Labb. tom. ii. Conc. p. 1758, neque in ullo istorum canonum hæc verba invenire potui. Grischov.)

^e Can. Apost. c. xiii. See before, note (*), p. 465. — Isidor. Pelusiot. lib. iii. ep. 259. Εἰ μὴν γὰρ παρὰ τοῦ δίκαιου κατηψηφισμένη πᾶσα ἰφεῖης ἢ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἄβυστος, καὶ συνηγανάπτουν ἅπαντες τῇ ταύτῃ θιμίνῃ τὴν ψῆφον, ἵσως ἂν καὶ οὗτοι σωφρονισθῶσι ἰγνωσιμάχῃ· νῦν δὲ ἅμα κατίγνωσται τις ἐπὶ τοῦτου, καὶ παρ' ἄλλου πολλάκις θιραπύσσεται, καὶ ἐκκλησία ἰτίτρα ἀναπισσταμένη, καὶ δορυφορία, καὶ δῶρα, καὶ γίνονται τῇ ἐκτεβλημένην χρηματισμὸς, ἢ μιτάσσεις.

ignorance, received him? To this it is here answered, That this did not excuse him, because he ought, by the rule of Catholic commerce, to receive no stranger to communion, that did not bring commendatory letters, or testimonials, from his own bishop, that he was in the communion of the Church. If any travelled without these, he was to be suspected as an excommunicated person, and accordingly treated as one under censure. But, what if a person was unjustly excommunicated by his own bishop, might not another bishop do him justice, by relaxing his unlawful bonds, and admit him to communion? I answer, No: for in this case the Church provided another more proper remedy, that every man should have liberty to appeal from the sentence of his own bishop to a provincial synod, which was by the canons of Nice,^f and others, appointed to be held twice a-year for this very purpose; that if any one was aggrieved by the censure of his own bishop, he might have his cause heard over again in a provincial synod, from which there lay no further appeal to any single bishop, no, not even to

^f Conc. Nic. c. v. See before, note (b), p. 466. — Conc. Antioch. c. vi. See before, note (t), p. 468. — Conc. Sardic. c. xvii. "Ἐρρίν, ἵνα εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος βίαν ὑπομένει ἀδικῶς ἐκκλησῆ, ἢ διὰ τὴν ἰσιστήμην, ἢ διὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἢ διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκδικίαν, καὶ φεύγων τὸν πύδνον, ἀδῶς καὶ καθυσταμένους ἄν τις ἰτίαν ἴλθοι πόλιν, μὴ καλυύσθαι ἐκτὶ ἐκ τοσούτων διάγυν, ὥς ἂν ἐκάνελθῃ, ἢ τῆς ὕβριος τῆς γεγενημένης αὐτῷ ἀπαλλαγὴν εὐρίσθαι δυνήσθαι. — Conc. Carth. II. c. viii. vol. ii. p. 641. Si quis presbyter a præpositio suo excommunicatus vel correptus fuerit, debet utique apud vicinos episcopos conqueri, ut ab ipsis ejus causa possit audiri, ac per ipsos suo episcopo reconciliari. — Can. x. Si quis episcopos in reatum aliquem incurrerit, et fuerit ei nimia necessitas, non posse plurimos congregare, ne in crimine remaneat, a duodecim episcopis audiatur et a sex presbyteris et a tribus diaconibus cum proprio suo episcopo. — Conc. Milevit. c. xxii. vol. ii. p. 1542. Placuit, ut presbyteri, diaconi, vel ceteri inferiores clerici, in causis, quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant: et inter eos quidquid est finiant, adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. — Conc. Carth. III. c. viii. vol. ii. p. 1168. Si presbyteri vel diaconi fuerint accusati, adjuncto sibi ex vicinis locis legitimo numero collegarum, id est, in presbyteri nomine quinque, in diaconi duobus; episcopi ipsorum causas discutiant, &c. — Conc. Vasens. c. v. Si quis episcopi sui sententiæ non acquiescit, recurrit ad synodum. — Conc. Venet. c. ix. vol. iv. p. 1056. Si quis fortasse episcopi sui judicium cøperit habere suspectum, aut ipsi de proprietate aliqua adversus ipsum episcopum fuerit nata contentio, aliorum episcoporum audientiam, non sæcularium potestatum, debebit ambire.

the bishop of Rome, who most pretended to it; but all such causes were to be heard and determined in the province where they arose, to obviate fraud and surreptitious communion, and put an end to all strife and contention, as has been shewed more fully in the foregoing chapter (sect. xiv.), out of the debate between the bishops of Rome and the African Churches. These were the rules then generally observed throughout the whole Catholic Church, with respect to the rejection of excommunicate persons from the communion of all Churches. And by these rules the unity of the Catholic Church was duly maintained, and discipline, for the most part, kept up in its true vigour and glory.

SECT. XI.—*And avoided also in civil Commerce and outward Conversation: and allowed no Memorial after Death.*

But, fourthly, Synesius, in the forementioned form of excommunication, not only speaks of denying men communion in sacred things, but also in civil commerce and external conversation: no one was to receive excommunicated persons into their houses, nor eat at the same table with them; they were not to converse with them familiarly, whilst living; nor perform the funeral obsequies for them when dead, after the solemn rites and manners that were used toward other Christians. These directions were drawn up upon the model of those rules of the apostles, which forbade Christians to give any countenance to notorious offenders, continuing impenitent, even in ordinary conversation. As that of St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 11): “I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one, no, not to eat.” And, again (Rom. xvi. 17): “Mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.” And (2 Thess. iii. 14), “If any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.” And that of St. John: “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him ‘God speed:’ for he that biddeth him ‘God speed,’

is partaker of his evil deeds" (2 John, 10, 11). In conformity to these rules, and the reasons here assigned for the observation of them, the ancients made strict laws to forbid all familiar intercourse with excommunicated persons in ordinary conversation, unless some absolute necessity, or some greater and more obliging moral consideration, required them to do otherwise. The first Council of Toledo has four or five canons to this purpose. It will be sufficient to recite the first of them, which is in these words :^s "If any layman is excommunicated, let no clerk or religious person come near him, or his house. In like manner, if a clergyman is excommunicated, let the clergy avoid him ; and if any is found to converse or eat with him, let him also be excommunicated." The second Council of Arles^b orders a suspended bishop to be excluded, not only from the conversation and table of the clergy, but of all the people likewise. And many other such canons occur in the Councils of Vannes,ⁱ and the first of Tours,^j and the first of Orleans,^k

^s Conc. Tolet. I. c. xv. vol. ii. p. 1225. Si quis laicus abstinetur, ad hunc, vel ad domum ejus, clericorum vel religiosorum nullus accedat. Similiter et clericus, si abstinetur, a clericis devitetur. Si quis cum illo colloqui aut convivari fuerit deprehensus, etiam ipse abstineatur.—Can. vii. Cum uxoribus ipsis, quæ peccaverint, nec cibum sumant, nisi forte ad timorem Dei, acta penitentia, revertantur.—Can. xvi. Devotam peccantem non recipiendam in ecclesiam, nisi peccare desierit, et desinens egerit aptam penitentiam decem annis, recipiat communionem. Prius autem quam in ecclesia admittatur ad orationem, ad nullum convivium Christianæ mulieris accedat. Quod si admissa fuerit, etiam hæc, quæ eam recepit, habeatur abstenta.—Can. xviii. Si qua vidua episcopi, sive presbyteri, aut diaconi, maritum acceperit, nullus clericus, nulla religiosa cum ea conviviumumat, numquam communicet.

^b Conc. Arelat. II. c. xxx. Suspensum episcopum non solum a clericorum, sed etiam a totius populi colloquio atque convivio placuit excludi.

ⁱ Conc. Venet. c. iii. vol. iv. p. 1055. Penitentes, qui susceptam publice penitentiam intermiserint, et ad prioris erroris consuetudinem revoluti, vitæ se sæculari conversationique reddiderint, non solum a communione Dominicorum sacramentorum, sed etiam a conviviis fidelium submovendos.—Conc. Ilerd. c. iv. vol. iv. p. 1611. De his, qui se incesta pollutione commaculant, placuit, ut quousque in ipso detestando et illicito carnis contubernio perseverant, usque ad missam tantum catechumenorum in ecclesia admittantur : cum quibus etiam nec cibum sumere ullum Christianorum, sicut apostolus jussit, oportet.

^j Conc. Turon. I. c. viii. A convivio fidelium extraneus habeatur.

^k Conc. Aurel. I. c. iii. Pro contemptu ecclesiæ et prævaricatione fidei, a communione et convivio Catholicorum extraneus habeatur. (iv. 1405.)—Conc.

excluding excommunicate persons from all entertainments of the faithful. The Apostolical Canons¹ forbid any one to communicate in prayer, so much as in a private house, with excommunicate persons, under the same penalty of excommunication; and, if they happened to die in professed rebellion, and contempt of penance, then they were treated as all other contemnners and despisers of holy ordinances were, by being denied the honour and benefit of Christian burial. No solemnity of psalmody or prayers was used at their funeral; nor were they ever to be mentioned among the faithful, out of the diptychs, or holy books of the Church, according to custom, in the prayers at the altar. This is evident, not only from what is said by Synesius, but from the whole tenour of ecclesiastical discipline; which excludes all that die in professed rebellion and contempt, from the privilege of Christian burial: such as catechumens dying in wilful neglect of baptism, and those that laid violent hands upon themselves, and suchlike, as all dying in impenitency and a desperate condition.^m And it is further evident from that very exception, which we have observed beforeⁿ to be made in favour of such humble penitents as modestly submitted to the discipline of the Church, and were labouring earnestly to obtain a readmission, but were snatched away by sudden death, before they could obtain the formality of an absolution: in this case, as I shewed, the canons^o allowed their oblations to be received, and their funeral obsequies to be celebrated, after the usual solemnity and manner of the

Carth. IV. c. lxx. Clericus hæreticorum et schismaticorum tam convivium quam sodalitates evitet æqualiter.

¹ Can. Apost. c. xi. *Εἰ τις ἀποστατήσῃ, καὶ ἐν ὀλῃ, συνιῆται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀφοσιώσθω.*

^m Conc. Bracar. I. c. xxxiv. xxxv. (Conc. II. c. xvi. xvii. apud Labb. tom. v. p. 841.) Placuit, ut hi, qui sibi ipsis aut per ferrum, aut per venenum, aut per præcipitium, aut suspendium, vel quolibet modo violentam inferunt mortem, nulla pro illis in oblatione commemoratio fiat, neque cum psalmis ad sepulturam eorum cadavera deducantur.—Can. xvii. Item placuit, ut catechumenis sine redemptione baptismi defunctis, simili modo, neque oblationis commemoratio, neque psallendi impendatur officium; nam et hoc per ignorantiam usurpatum est.

ⁿ Chap. i. sect. vii.

^o Conc. Valens. II. c. ii. See chap. i. sect. vii. note (1), p. 407.

Church: which exception supposes, that all the rest who died refractory and impenitent, were wholly denied these privileges, as a just consequence of their censures. Not to mention now the custom of erasing the names of excommunicate persons out of the diptychs, or sacred registers of the Church, which was the immediate effect of excommunication, and excluded them from all the privileges of any future memorial,^p or commemoration, till they were restored again. I will not stand now to dispute whether this custom took its original from the practice of the Jewish synagogue; or whether our Saviour alluded to that practice, as some learned men think,^q when he said to his disciples (Luke, vi. 22), “Blessed are ye, when they shall separate,” or excommunicate, “you of the synagogue, and cast out,” or expunge, “your names out of the holy books.” Certain it is, that as this erasing or expunging the names of excommunicate persons out of the diptychs was used in the Christian Church, it always implied the denial of communion to them even after death: they could neither have a Christian burial, nor a Christian commemoration, among those that were departed in the true faith and unity of the Church; but were excluded, both living and dying, from all society, both sacred and civil, as the immediate effect and consequence, either of a voluntary and chosen, or a judicial and penal excommunication.

For to shew that these were not mere empty and ineffective laws, we may often observe them, in a remarkable manner, put in practice. Irenæus tells us,^r from those who had it from the mouth of Polycarp, that when he once occasionally accompanied St. John into a bath at Ephesus, and

^p Evagr. lib. iii. c. xxiv. (Vales. p. 354.)

^q Dodwel. Dissert. v. in Cyprian. sect. xviii. Huc referenda existimo illa Salvatoris verba, Μακάριοι, κ. τ. λ. De synagogæ censuris hæc intellexisse Dominum, constat e voce ἀφορίζουσι. Ita enim excommunicationem denotabant Judæi Hellenistæ, ita etiam ecclesiastici, nec ulla vox frequentius occurrit in canonibus.

^r Iren. lib. iii. c. iii. (Grabe, 1702, p. 204, 4.) Εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκηκόοντες αὐτοῦ, ὅτι Ἰωάννης δ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς, ἐν τῇ Ἐφίῳ πορευθεὶς λούσασθαι, καὶ ἰδὼν Ἰωὴ Κήρινθον, ἐξῆλπε τοῦ βαλανίου μὴ λουσάμενος, ἀλλ' ἰσχυρῶς, Φύγωμεν, μὴ καὶ τὸ βαλάνιον συμπίῃ, ἵδων ὅτις Κηρίνθου, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἰχθυοῦ.

they there found Cerinthus the heretic, St. John immediately cried out to Polycarp, "Let us fly hence, lest the bath should fall, in which Cerinthus, the enemy of truth, is." Eusebius and Theodoret^a both mention the same story out of Irenæus; and Epiphanius also relates it large,^t only with this difference, that it was Ebion the heretic, to whom, by the guidance of the Spirit, he shewed this aversion, for a memorial and example to future ages. Whence Baronius conjectures,^u both those heretics might be present; and that the saying had equal relation to them both. Irenæus, in the same place, adds this further concerning Polycarp, that, happening once to meet Marcion the heretic, and Marcion asking him whether he did not know him, he replied, "Yes, I know thee to be the first-born of Satan." "So cautious," says Irenæus,^v "were the apostles and their disciples, 'not to communicate so much as in word,' *μη μέχρι λόγου κοινωνεῖν*, with the perverters of truth; according to that of St. Paul, 'A man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that such a one is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.'" In like manner, St. Ambrose observes of a certain Christian judge,^x in the time of Julian, that having condemned one of his brethren

^a Euseb. lib. iii. c. iii. ubi eadem verba leguntur. — Theodoret. de Fabul. Hæretic. lib. ii. c. iii. Ταῦτον, ὡς φασιν, ὁ Διοσπίσιος Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπαγγελιστὴς λουόμενος Διασάμινος· συνίεν γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸν δι' ἀρρώστιαν χεῖρσιν τῷ βαλανίῳ· φύγωμεν εἴπαν ἐντιυῖθιν, μὴ διὰ Κήρινον τοῦ βαλανίου πισόντος, τῆς βλάβης καὶ ἡμῖς συμμιτάσχωμεν. (Hal. 1772, iv. 430.)

^t Epiphani. Hæres. xxx. Ebionit. sect. xxiv. vol. i. p. 149. Σπύσαστε, ἀδελφοί, ἴφθι, ἐξέλθωμεν ἐντιυῖθιν, μὴ πίσῃ τὸ βαλανίον, καὶ ἀπολώμεθα μιστὰ Ἐβίωνος, τοῦ ἔδον ἐν τῷ βαλανίῳ, διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀσίβιαν.

^u Baron. an. 74, n. ix. Ne dicamus Epiphanium esse hallucinatum, haud inconveniens erit existimare, utrumque simul in balneis repertum esse: siquidem magna necessitudo, ex impietatis similitudine comparata, intercedebat inter eos, &c. — Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. voce *αἰρετικὸς*, tom. i. p. 128. Quid si uterque, Ebion nimirum et Cerinthus, ut ejusdem fere impietatis professores, tum in balneum vel ex conducto, aut præter spem simul convenissent?

^v Iren. lib. iii. c. iii. (Grabe, p. 204, 9.) Αὐτοὶ δὲ ὁ Παλὺπαρτος Μαρκιῶνι ποτε εἰς ὄψιν αὐτῷ ἰλθόντι καὶ φήσαντι, Ἐπιγινώσκεις ἡμᾶς; ἀπεκρίθη, Ἐπιγινώσκω τὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Σατανᾶ· τοσαύτην οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν ἔσχον ἐνδράσειαν, πρὸς τὸ μὴδὲ μέχρι λόγου κοινωνεῖν τινὶ τῶν παραχαρασσάντων τὴν ἁλθίαν, ὡς καὶ Παῦλος ἴφθισιν, Αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον, κ. τ. λ.

^x Ambros. Epist. xxix. ad Theod. (ep. xvii. tom. v. p. 214, b. edit. Paris. 1642.)

for demolishing an altar, no one would vouchsafe to associate with him ; no one would speak to him or salute him. And St. Basil, writing to Athanasius, concerning a certain governor of Libya (whom Athanasius had excommunicated for his immoralities, and, according to custom, had given notice of it to Basil), tells him, "They would all avoid him, and have no communication with him in fire, or water, or house," that is, in the common ways of ordinary conversation. A great many other instances of the like kind might be given, but I shall only add that of Monnica, St. Austin's mother, toward her son, whilst he continued a Manichee. St. Austin himself tells us, "That she so detested the blasphemies of his error, and had such an aversion to him upon the account of them, that she would not admit him to eat with her at the same table in her own house." This was according to the discipline then practised in the Church, to deny sinners not only communion in sacred things, but also in the civil commerce of ordinary conversation.

SECT. XII.—*The Grounds and Reasons of this Practice.*

Now all this was done for very wise ends and reasons of Christian prudence and charity. 1. To make sinners ashamed, and by that shame, to bring them to repentance. This is the reason given by the apostle: "Note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." 2. To terrify others by their example. Both these reasons are assigned by the canon of the Council of Tours,* which orders relapsing sinners to be excluded both from the communion of the Church and the entertainments of the faithful ; that the shame and confusion arising from such treatment might bring them to compunction, and terrify others by their

† Basil. Ep. xlvii. Ἀποτρέψαι αὐτὸν πάντες ἡγήσονται, μὴ πυρὸς, μὴ ὕδατος, μὴ σκιάσης αὐτοῦ κοινοῦντες.

* Aug. Confess. lib. iii. c. xi. Nolle habere secum eandem mensam in domo, aversans et detestans blasphemias erroris mei. (1700, vol. i. 68.)

* Conc. Turon. I. c. viii. Si quis post acceptam penitentiam, sicut canis ad vomitum suum, ita ad sæculares illecebras, derelicta quam professus est penitentia, fuerit reversus, a communione ecclesiæ, vel a convivio fidelium extraneus habeatur, quo facilius et ipse compunctionem per hanc confusionem accipiat, et alii ejus terreantur exemplo. (Labb. iv. p. 1052.)

example. 3. A third reason was the fear of partaking in other men's sins; if, by their society, they seemed to shew any countenance to them, it would be a hardening them in their iniquity, and involve such as contributed thereto, in the same guilt with the criminals themselves. "Therefore," says St. Cyprian,^b "we ought to withdraw from sinners, and even fly from them, lest if a man join himself to those that walk disorderly, and go in the paths of error and wickedness, he himself also be held in the guilt of the same crimes." For this reason, writing to the people of Leon and Astorga, in Spain (where two bishops, Basilides and Martial, had been deposed for lapsing into idolatry, who afterwards made an attempt to draw in the people to accept them again for their bishops, after others had regularly, by the discipline of the Church, been ordained in their room), he tells them,^c "They should not flatter themselves, as if they were free from partaking in sin, if they communicated with a sinful bishop, and gave their consent to the unlawful and unjust establishment of him in his bishoprick, since the Divine judgment had threatened and said by the prophet Hosea, 'Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners: all that eat thereof, shall be polluted:' teaching and shewing us, that all men are bound over unto sin, who are defiled with the sacrifice of a profane and unjust priest. Which we find also to be declared in the book of Numbers, when

^b Cyprian. de Unitat. Eccles. (p. 85, edit. Amstelod. 1700.) Recedendum est a delinquentibus, vel immo fugiendum, ne dum quis male ambulanti jungitur, et per itinera erroris et criminis graditur, a via veri itineris exerrans, pari crimine ipse teneatur. (Oxon. 1682, p. 119.)

^c Ibid. Epist. lxxviii. al. lxxvii. ad Plebem Legionis et Asturicæ, p. 171, (p. 288, edit. cit.) Nec sibi plebs blandiatur, quasi immunis esse a contagio delicti possit, cum sacerdote peccatore communicans, et ad injustum atque illicitum præpositi sui episcopatum consensum suum commodans, quando per Osee prophetam comminetur et dicat censura Divina, 'Sacrificia eorum tamquam panis luctus: omnes, qui manducant ea, contaminabuntur.' Docens scilicet et ostendens omnes omnino ad peccatum constringi, qui fuerint profani et injusti sacerdotis sacrificio contaminati. Quod item in Numeris manifestari invenimus, quando Chore, et Dathan, et Abiron contra Aaron sacerdotem sacrificandi sibi licentiam vindicaverunt. Illic quoque per Moysen præcepit Dominus, ut ab eis populus separaretur, ne facinorosis conjunctus eodem facinore et ipse perstringatur, 'Separamini,' inquit, 'a tabernaculis hominum istorum durissimorum, et nolite tangere ea quæ ad eos pertinent, ne simul pereatis in peccato eorum.'

Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, assumed to themselves the power of offering sacrifice, in opposition to Aaron the priest. There the Lord commanded the people, by Moses, to separate themselves from them, lest, if they were joined with those wicked men, they should be smitten in their wickedness. 'Depart,' says he, 'from the tents of these hardened men, and touch nothing of theirs, lest ye be consumed in all their sins.'" 4. A fourth reason was, to avoid contagion and infection. For conversing with profane men is endangering a man's own virtue. Evil communications corrupt good manners. An infected member often destroys the whole body. Therefore, as vile and notorious sinners were, for this reason, cut off from the body of the Church; so, for the same reason, all men were afterwards to avoid their society, for fear the poison of their infamous conversation should infect their morals, and diffuse itself into their minds by any artful conveyance of cunning craftiness, or the natural influence of bad example. "For wicked men speak with their feet, and teach with their fingers," as the Wise Man elegantly words it: their actions, as well as their discourses, are of a malignant influence, and are apt to leave ill tinctures and impressions upon the minds of others, so that a man cannot ordinarily converse with them without danger of infection. "Therefore," says Cyprian,^d "avoid such men, and drive away their pernicious communications both from your conversation and your ears, as the contagion of death. For thus it is written, 'Hedge about thy ears with thorns, and hearken not to an evil tongue.' And again, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners.' Our Lord teaches and admonishes us to withdraw from such, saying, 'They are blind leaders of the blind: and if the blind lead the blind, they shall both fall into the ditch.'" But, fifthly, admitting

^d Cyprian. de Unitat. Eccles. (1682, p. 115), (p. 83, edit. Amstelod.) Vitæ, uasō vos, ejusmodi homines, et a latere atque auribus vestris perniciosa colloquia, velut contagium mortis, arcete, sicut scriptum est, 'Sepi aures tuas spinis, et noli audire linguam nequam.' Et iterum, 'Corrumpunt ingenia bona confabulationes pessimæ.' Docet Dominus, et admonet a talibus recedendum. 'Cæci sunt duces cæcorum; cæcus autem cæcum ducens, simul in foveam cadent.' Aversandus est talis atque fugiendus, quisquis fuerit ab ecclesia separatus.

some could converse with such without danger to themselves, they could not without manifest danger to others, who are weak and apt to be emboldened to follow the example of the strong to their apparent ruin and destruction. For these and the like reasons, whenever the Church cast any notorious offenders wholly out of her communion, she prohibited all others from conversing with them, both in kindness to the sinners and to the righteous; lest the one should be hardened in their impenitency, and the other corrupted by the spreading contagion and infection.

SECT. XIII. — *No Donations or Oblations allowed to be received from excommunicate Persons.*

It is further observable, that as an indication of the Church's abhorrence of excommunicate persons, she allowed no gifts or oblations to be received from them; because that might have been interpreted retaining them still, in some measure, in her communion, and involving herself in the guilt of filthy lucre. Therefore she never admitted any one to make oblations but such as were in full communion with her, and might lawfully partake of the sacrifice at the altar; as I have had occasion to shew more fully in another place.* Here I only note it again as a thing most remarkable, that she had such an aversion to any thing that appertained to them, that she would not so much as retain those gifts, which any such persons had freely offered, whilst they were in communion with her. This we learn from Tertullian, who, speaking of the expulsion of Valentinus and Marcion, for their heresies at Rome, says,^f "They were cast out once and again; and particularly Marcion, with his two hundred *sestertia*, which he had brought into the church."

* Book xv. chap. ix.

^f Tertul. de Præscript. adv. Hæretic. c. xxx. Ubi tunc Marcion, Ponticus nauclerus, Stoicæ studiosus? Ubi Valentinus, Platonicae sectator? Nam constat illos neque adeo olim fuisse, Antonini fere principatu, et in Catholicae primo doctrinam credidisse apud ecclesiam Romanensem, sub episcopatu Eleutherii benedicti, donec ob inquietam semper eorum curiositatem, quam fratres quoque vitabant, semel et iterum ejecti, Marcion quidem cum ducentis sestertiis, quæ ecclesiæ intulerat, novissime in perpetuum discidium relegati, venena doctrinarum suarum disseminaverunt. (Paris. 1664, p. 212, C.)

SECT. XIV.—*No one to marry with excommunicate Heretics, or receive their Eulogiæ, or read their Books; but burn them.*

There are several other instances of their aversion to heretics in particular, when once the censures of the Church were passed upon them. The Council of Laodicea^s not only forbids all men to frequent their cemeteries and meetings held at the monuments of their pretended martyrs, or any where to pray with them; but also to receive any presents under the name of *eulogiæ*, from them;^h because this was, in some sort, to communicate with them; these *eulogiæ*, or ‘sanctified loaves,’ being one way of testifying men’s communion one with another. The same Council also forbids all members of the Church to enter into communion with heretics,ⁱ by giving their sons or daughters in marriage to them; neither are they allowed to take the sons or daughters of heretics in marriage to themselves, unless they promise to become Christians.^j Where we may observe also that they did not allow heretics, after they had broken the faith and communion of the Church, absolutely speaking, so much as the name of Christians. Other laws strictly prohibit men to read the books of heretics, as imagining that the poison of their errors was in a great measure dispersed and conveyed by them. Socrates has recorded a

^s Conc. Laodic. c. ix. vol. i. p. 1497. Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ συγχωρεῖν εἰς τὰ κοιμητήρια, ἢ εἰς τὰ λιγόμενα μαρτύρια, πάντων τῶν αἰρετικῶν, ἀπίνειν τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, εὐχῆς ἢ θρασκίας ἱερεῖς, κ. τ. λ.—Can. xxxiii. “Ὅτι οὐ δι’ αἰρετικούς ἢ σχισματικούς συνύχισθαι—Can. xxxiv. “Ὅτι οὐ δι’ πάντα Χριστιανῶν ἱκαναλαΐσιν μάρτυρας Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀπίνειν πρὸς τοὺς ψευδομάρτυρας, τοῦτ’ ἐστίν, αἰρετικῶν, ἢ αὐτοὺς πρὸς τοὺς προειρημένους αἰρετικούς γινόμενους· οὗτοι γὰρ ἄλλότριον τοῦ Θεοῦ συγχάνουσιν.

^h Ibid. c. xxxii. “Ὅτι οὐ δι’ αἰρετικῶν εὐλογίας λαμβάνειν, αἱ τινὲς εἰσιν ἀλογίαι μᾶλλον, ἢ εὐλογίαι.

ⁱ Ibid. c. x. Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ δύναι τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀδιαφόρους πρὸς γάμου κοινωνίαν συνάπτειν τὰ ἑαυτῶν παῖδια αἰρετικοῦς.

^j Ibid. c. xxxi. “Ὅτι οὐ δι’ πρὸς πάντας αἰρετικούς ἱπιγαμίας ποιῶν, ἢ δίδοναι υἱούς, ἢ θυγατέρας, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον λαμβάνειν, εἴγε ἱσαγγέλλοιντο Χριστιανοὶ γίνεσθαι.—Conc. Illiber. c. xvi. vol. i. p. 972. Hæretici, si se transferre noluerint ad ecclesiam Catholicam, nec ipsis Catholicas dandas esse puellas; sed neque Judæis, neque hæreticis, dare placuit; eo quod nulla possit esse societas fidei cum infideli.

letter^k of Constantine the Great, wherein he orders the Arians to be branded and stigmatized with the name of Porphyrians, and their books to be burnt, and makes it death for any one to conceal them and save them from the flames. And there are two laws now extant in the Theodosian Code, wherein the very same things are enjoined under very severe penalties. The first is a law made by Arcadius and Honorius against the Eunomians, a noted branch of the Arian heresy,^l wherein their books are ordered to be sought after with a diligent search, and to be burnt in the sight of the judges. And if any one was convicted of fraudulent hiding, and not discovering them, he should be punished with death, as a retainer and concealer of pernicious and magical books, containing the institutions of all manner of wickedness. The other law was made by Theodosius Junior against the Nestorians, where he refers to the former law of Constantine; and orders the followers of Nestorius to be called Simonians, for their imitating the portentous superstitions of Simon Magus, as Constantine had appointed the Arians to be called Porphyrians, from Porphyry, the heathen. Then he orders their books, written against the Catholic faith and the Council of Ephesus, to be publicly burnt,^m forbidding any

^k Socrat. lib. i. c. ix. (Vales. 27, B.) "Ἐδοξεν Ἀρειὸν τι καὶ τοὺς Ἀρειοῦ ὁμολογώμενας, Πορφυριανοὺς μὲν καλεῖσθαι, ἢ δὲ τοὺς τρέπους μιμνήμενται, ταύτων ἔχουσι καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ εἴ τι σύγγραμμα ὑπὸ Ἀρειοῦ συνταγμένον εὐρίσκειτο, τοῦτο πυρὶ παραδίδεσθαι. . . . ἰκίνο μὲν τοι προσηγορίαν, ὡς εἴ τις σύγγραμμα ὑπὸ Ἀρειοῦ συνταγὴν φεραβίη κρύψας, καὶ μὴ εὐθὺς προσηγόντων πυρὶ καταναλώσῃ, τοῦτο θάνατος ἴσται ἢ ζημία.

^l Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. xxxiv. Eunomianæ superstitionis Clerici, seu Montanistæ, consortio vel conversatione civitatum universarum atque urbium expellantur. . . . Codices sane eorum, scelorum omnium doctrinam ac materiam continentes, summa sagacitate mox quæri ac prodi, exerta auctoritate mandamus, sub aspectibus eorum judicantium incendio mox cremandos. Ex quibus si qui forte aliquid qualibet occasione vel fraude occultasse, nec prodidisse convincitur, sciatur, se velut noxiorum codicum, et malefici crimine conscriptorum, retentatorem, capite esse plectendum. (Lugd. 1665, vol. vi. p. 152.)

^m Ibid. lib. xvi. tit. v. leg. lxvi. p. 190, et in Actis Conc. Ephes. part. iii. c. xlv. Damnato portentosæ superstitionis auctore Nestorio, nota congrui nominis ejus inuratur gregalibus, ne Christianorum appellatione abutantur: sed quemadmodum Ariani lege divæ memoriæ Constantini ob similitudinem impietatis Porphyriani a Porphyrio nuncupantur, sic utique participes nefariæ sectæ Nestorii Simoniani vocentur: ut cujus scelus sunt in deserendo Deo imitati, ejus vocabulum jure videantur esse sortiti. Nec vero impios libros nefandi sacrilegii

one to have, read, or transcribe them, under pain of confiscation. This custom of burning heretical books is confirmed by many other laws; of which more hereafter, when we come to speak of the punishment of heretics in particular. Here I observe, that the prohibition of reading or retaining them, was so limited by the Church, as to allow bishops to read them, when time and necessity so required, in order to confute them.^a For the fourth Council of Carthage, which forbids them universally the reading of heathen authors, allows the reading of heretical books with this limitation and restriction. And, therefore, the retaining them in this case was not to be interpreted that fraudulent retaining and concealment which the imperial laws condemned under the penalties of confiscation and death. Gothofred observes one thing further upon the usefulness and effect of these laws, which is fit to be remarked,^o “That the terror of them made heretics very cautious how they dispersed their books, and others as cautious how they retained or concealed them:” insomuch, that when St. Basil was about to confute the first book of Eunomius, he had a hard matter to compass it, as Photius reports,^p the Eunomians were so industrious in concealing it. And when Eunomius had written his latter books in answer to Basil, he durst not publish them, but only among his confederates, in St. Basil’s lifetime, for fear of Basil; and, after his death,^q durst only trust them in the

Nestorii adversus venerabilem orthodoxorum sectam, decretaque sanctissimi cœtus antistitum Ephesi habitū scriptos habere, aut legere, aut describere quāquam audeat: quos diligenti studio requiri, ac publice comburi decernimus: Ita, ut nemo in religionis disputatione aliquam supradicto nomine faciat mentionem: Aut quibusdam eorum habendi concilii gratia, in ædibus, aut villa, aut suburbano suo, aut alio quolibet loco, conventiculum, clam aut aperte, præbeat; quos omni conventus celebrandi licentia privari statuimus: Scientibus universis, violatorem hujus legis publicatione bonorum esse coërcendum.

^a Conc. Carth. IV. c. xvi. (vol. ii. p. 1201.) Ut episcopus Gentilium libros non legat; hæreticorum autem pro necessitate et tempore. See Book vi. chap. iii. sect. iv. where this question is treated more largely.

^o Gothofred. in Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. xxxiv. p. 153.

^p Photius, Cod. cxxxvii. Κρύβιον δὲ καὶ ἀνίφορον τοῖς ἄλλοις εἶναι διασπού-
δατο, μάλιστα πρὸς τὸ μέγας Βασίλειος ἐπὶ χειρὸς λαβεῖν δυνήσεις, κ. τ. λ.

^q Ibid. Cod. cxxxviii. Ἐπιμελῶς, καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ τοῦ Κρόνου μῦθος τὸ γέννημα καταπιὼν, ἱερουργεῖ τι καὶ συνιάλυσσεν· μέχρις ἂν ἡ Βασιλείου ζωὴ σφ’ ἱπικήρην παρατινομίην βίῃ τὸν φόβον ἐπίσσειν· ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἐκείνος ἀνῆλθεν τὴν παροικίαν λαπὼν, εἰς τὸν οἰκίον καὶ οὐράνιον κλῆρον ἀνέδραμι. τοῦ πολλοῦ λυθέντος δέους, ὅτι τοῦ καιροῦ τὸ δημοσιεύειν ὑπῆρχεν, οὔτε τότε πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς φίλοις ἰδιόρρησιν.

hands of his friends, for fear of the penalties which the laws had laid upon them; though Philostorgius,^r the Arian historian, makes bold, after his manner, to give a different relation of it.

SECT. XV.—*What meant by Delivering unto Satan.*

There are two or three things more, relating to the manner, and form, and effects of excommunication, which have something of difficulty in them; and therefore it will be proper to give them a little explication here. The first difficulty arises from the apostle's order given to the Corinthians, how to proceed against the incestuous person, who had married his father's wife (1 Cor. v. 5), where he enjoins them, in the name, and with the power, of the Lord Jesus Christ, to "deliver such a one unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." So again (1 Tim. i. 20), speaking of Hymenæus and Philetus, he says, "Whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." There are two famous expositions of these passages. Bishop Beveridge^s and Estius,^t after Balsamon and Zonaras,^u with many other modern interpreters, whom Estius mentions, think that "'delivering unto Satan'

^r Philostorg. lib. viii. c. xii. in Epitome Confecta a Photio. "Οτι οὐ μόνον τὸν μίγον Βασίλειον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἀπολλωνάριον λίγυ πρὸς τὴν ἀπολογίαν Εὐνομίου ἀντιγράψαι· ὅσα πάλιν Εὐνομίου ἐν πίντε λόγοις συμπλακίντες Βασιλείῳ, ἐντυχὺν ἐκύνον τῷ πρώτῳ, καὶ βαρυνόμενα λιπαῖν τὸν βίον. (Vales. p. 514, D.)

^s Bever. Not. in Can. Apost. x. Ipse fundator et caput ecclesiæ in mandatis dedit, ut qui ecclesiam audire neglexerit, sit ὡς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐκκλησία, Matth. xviii. 17, hoc est, 'ecclesia ejiciatur,' sive excommunicetur. Quod D. Paulus postea expressit per παραδύναι τῷ Σατανᾷ, 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Tim. i. 20.

^t Estius, in 1 Cor. v. 5, pp. 232, 233. Dicuntur enim qui ad hunc modum excommunicantur, tradi Satanæ, quia projecti extra societatem fidelium, quæ est ecclesia Christi, et per hoc privari bonis omnibus illi societati propriis ac peculiaribus, veluti sunt orationes ac suffragia communia, sacramentorum participatio, specialis Divina protectio, cura pastoralis eorum, qui præsunt et cetera talia; tyrannidi et incursibus diaboli, cujus regnum est extra ecclesiam, relinquuntur expositi.

^u Balsam. in Basil. c. vii. 'Εκύνει δὲ λίγεται παραδέναι τῷ Σατανᾷ, οἱ χωρίζονται ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν πιστῶν· οἱ γοῦν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον χρόνον ἀφορίζονται, ὥστε τῷ Σατανᾷ παραδέναν.—Zonar. ibid. Τινὲς μὲν δαίμονι πάτοχον γινίσθαι τὸν πορεύσαντα λίγουσι· τινὲς δὲ, νόσου μάστιγι ἐκδοθῆναι καὶ τοι ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῶν λυομένου τοῦ ἀμφιβόλου, καὶ δηλουμένου, ὅτι τὸ παραδέναι τῷ Σατανᾷ ἀφορίζεσθαι ἐστὶ, κ. τ. λ.

is but another expression for excommunication, and the spiritual effects consequent to it; that is, the punishment of the soul, and not of the body. For when men are cast out of the society of the faithful, which is the Church of Christ, they are thereby deprived of all the benefits that are proper and peculiar to that society; as the common prayers of the Church, the public use of the word or doctrine, the participation of the sacrament, the pastoral care of those that preside over them, and the special grace of Divine protection; and so remain exposed to the tyranny and incursions of Satan, whose kingdom is without the Church." And thus far they allow, that every excommunicated person was delivered unto Satan, but not for any corporal vexation or punishment to be inflicted on him. Others are of opinion, that besides this spiritual punishment, naturally consequent to excommunication, there was, in the apostle's days, another consequent of it, which was corporal power and possession, or the infliction of bodily vexations and torments, by the ministry of Satan on those who were delivered unto him. Dr. Hammond, and Grotius, and Lightfoot, are the great supporters of this opinion among the moderns, and they have almost the general concurrence of the ancient interpreters on their side: which Estius does not much deny, though he chose to follow Peter Lombard and Aquinas, and the ordinary gloss against them. He owns St. Chrysostom and the Greeks were wholly of this opinion; and among the Latins, St. Ambrose and Pacian; and St. Austin also, though not very positive, he thinks, in his assertion. But he is mistaken; for St. Austin was clearly of this opinion. He does not say, indeed, it was death which the apostle inflicted upon the Corinthian, as St. Peter did upon Ananias and Sapphira; but he says expressly, that it was some punishment inflicted on him by the ministry of Satan.* Which he distinguishes from a common excommunication, by the name of *flagellum Domini*, 'the scourge of the Lord;' "Which," he says,† "the

* Aug. de Serm. Dom. in Monte, lib. i. c. xx. (Bened. vol. iii. part. ii. p. 139, D.) Etsi nolunt heic mortem intelligere, fortasse enim incertum est, quamlibet vindictam per Satanam factam ab apostolo fateantur.

† Ibid. cont. Ep. Parmen. lib. iii. c. ii. (tom vii. opp. p. 61, edit. Basil. 1569), (Bened. vol. ix. p. 43, C.) Revera, si contagio peccandi multitudinem invaserit, divinæ disciplinæ severa misericordia necessaria est: nam consilia separationis

apostle used upon some special occasions, when there was no way to cure an epidemical disease, or correct a single sinner, buoyed up and favoured by the multitude, but only by interceding with God to take the matter into his own hand, and use the severe mercy of his own Divine discipline upon them, when the contagion of sin had invaded a multitude: in which case, it were not only in vain to advise men to separate from sinners, but pernicious and sacrilegious; because such counsels, in such a state of affairs, would be thought impious and proud; and more tend to disturb good men that were weak, than correct the stubbornness and animosity of the evil." In this sense, he there also, in like manner, interprets two other passages of the apostle (2 Cor. xii. 21): "Lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you; and I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and lasciviousness, and fornication which they have committed." And (2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2): "This is the third time I am coming to you: in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. I foretold you before, and foretell you as if I were present the second time, and being absent, I now write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that if I come again, I will not spare; since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me." "Here," he says,^a "the apostle does not threaten them with that punishment, which should make others abstain from their society, but, by his prayers and tears, to turn them over to the Divine scourge to correct them; and that this was the power of Christ speaking in him." Where nothing can be plainer, than that St. Austin distinguishes this as an extraordinary power from the ordinary power of excommunication, which the apostle had in reserve for such difficult cases, where the ordinary power of excommunication, by reason of the multitude or confederacy of sinners, would not, by its own bare virtue, prove effectual. So that, according to him, this

et inania sunt et pernicioſa atque ſacrilega, quia et impia et ſuperba fiunt, et plus perturbant infirmos bonos, quam corrigunt animoſos malos.

^a Aug. cont. Ep. Parmen. lib. iii. c. ii. (tom. vii. opp. p. 61, edit. Basil. 1569.)
Per luctum ſuum potius eos Divino flagello coërcendos minans, quam per illam correptionem, ut ceteri ab eorum conjunctione ſe contineant. (Vol. ix. p. 43, B.)

power of delivering unto Satan, was something superior to that ordinary power of casting men out of the Church and the society of the faithful. St. Ambrose was of the same mind with St. Austin: for, explaining how the incestuous man was punished, he says,^a “As the Lord gave the devil no power over the soul of holy Job, but only permitted him to afflict his body; so this man was delivered to Satan.” And St. Jerom,^b “The apostle commanded him to be put under penance for the destruction and vexation of the flesh, by fasting and sickness, that his spirit might be saved.” And so Pacianus,^c by the destruction of the flesh, understands tribulation and infirmities of the body. The author of the Short Notes, under the name of St. Jerom, says the same.^d So likewise Cassian,^e to whom Estius himself adds Primasius

^a Ambros. de Pœnit. lib. i. c. xii. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 98.) Sicut Dominus in animam sancti Job potestatem non dedit, sed in carnem ejus permisit licentiam, ita et hic traditur Satanæ in interitum carnis.

^b Hieron. Comment. in Galat. v. Præcepit eum tradi pœnitentiæ, in interitum et vexationem carnis, per jejunia et ægrotationes, ut spiritus salvus fiat.

^c Pacian. Epist. iii. ad Sempron. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 66, (tom. iv. p. 313, d. edit. Lugd. 1677.) Vides quod hic ipse peccator incestus non morti traditur, sed Satanæ ad emendandum, ad colophizandum, ad pœnitendum. Ad interitum carnis, non tamen animæ, non etiam spiritus, sed ad solius carnis interitum, tentationes scilicet, carnis angustias, detrimenta membrorum.

^d Hieron. Comment. in 1 Cor. v. 5. Tradere hujusmodi.] Ut arripiendi illum corporaliter habeat potestatem. Quod cum viderit se nec carnis heic, nec in futuro spiritus requiem habiturum, de facto pœniteat, ut salvetur. Sive sic quisque pro meritis suis de ecclesia pellitur, Satanæ traditur potestati: ut dum caro ejus per pœnitentiam adflicta quemdam interitum patitur, spiritus conservetur. (Venet. vol. xi. p. 234.)

^e Cassian. Collat. vii. c. xxv. (Lips. 1733, p. 326.) Corporaliter traditos Satanæ, vel infirmitatibus magnis etiam viros sanctos novimus pro levissimis quibusque delictis, &c.—Cap. xxvii. p. 328. Diro confestim est traditus dæmoni, ut humanas egestionem ori suo ab eo suppletus ingereret. Quod flagellum purgationis gratia se Dominus intulisse, ne scilicet in eo vel momentanei delicti macula resideret, velocitate curationis ejus atque auctore remedii demonstravit.—Cap. xxviii. p. 329. Ex quo manifeste perpenditur, non debere eos abominari vel despici, quos videmus diversis tentationibus, sive istis nequitia spiritibus tradi; quia duo hæc credere immobiliter nos oportet: primo, quod sine Dei permissu nullus ab eis omnino tentetur: secundo quod omnia, quæ a Deo nobis inferuntur, sive tristia ad præsens seu læta videantur, velut a piissimo patre clementissimoque medico pro nostris utilitatibus irrogentur: et idcirco eos velut pædagogis traditos humiliari, ut discedentes ex hoc mundo, vel purgatiores ad vitam aliam transferantur, vel pœna leviori plectantur, qui secundum apostolum traditi sunt in præsenti Satanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus fiat in die Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

and Haymo. St. Chrysostom, among the Greeks, gives the same sense of the apostle's words. He says, "The apostle delivered the Corinthian offender to Satan, as to a school-master, for the destruction of the flesh. As it happened to holy Job, but not for the same cause: for there it was done to make his crown of glory more illustrious; but here the man only gains remission of his sins: that Satan might torture him with some cruel ulcer, or other disease." And he observes how the apostle says elsewhere, that such diseases were sometime inflicted on sinners immediately by the hand of God:† "When we suffer such things, we are judged of the Lord: but here he delivers him to Satan, the more sensibly to touch and affect him." He gives the same exposition of the apostle's words concerning Hymenæus and Philetus, "Whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." "As executioners," says he,‡ "though they be very wicked themselves, are made instruments of chastising others; so here it is with the wicked devils. Job was thus delivered to Satan, not for his sins, but to obtain the greater glory." He adds, "That God often did this immediately by his own power, without the intervention of any human ministry. For many times the priests know not who are sinners, or who are unworthy partakers of the holy mysteries: therefore God takes the judgment into his own hands, and delivers them unto Satan. For when diseases, or misfortunes, or sorrows, or calamities, or any thing of the like kind befalls men, it is for this reason, as

† Chrysostom. Hom. xv. in 1 Cor. p. 451, (p. 153, c. edit. Francof.) "Ὡςτις παιδαγωγῶ τὸν τοιοῦτον παραδιδούς . . . Εἰς εὐθερίαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὥςτις ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίου ἰὼς γίγονιν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτῆς υποθέσεως· ἐκὶ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ σσιφάνων λαμπεροτέρων, ἰσταῦθα δὲ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτημάτων λύσεως· ἵνα μαστιγῇ αὐτὸν ἔλκυ πονηρῷ, ἢ νόσῳ ἰστέρε. καὶ μὴν ἀλλαχού φησιν, "Οτι ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου κρινόμεθα ταῦτα πάσχοντες· ἀλλ' ἰσταῦθα μᾶλλον καθάψασθαι θύλων, τῷ Σατανῇ παραδίδωσι."

‡ Ibid. Hom. v. in 1 Tim. p. 1547, (pp. 436, 437, edit. cit.) "Ὡςτις οἱ δῆμον μυσίαν γίμοντες κακῶν τοὺς ἄλλους σωφρονίζουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἰσταῦθα ἐπὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος.—(P. 1548.) Οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἰὼς παρὶδότη τῷ Σατανῇ· ἀλλ' ἐκὶνους οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ πλείονος ὑδοκμήσεως. Πολλὰ ταιαῦτα γίνονται, καὶ νῦν ἰπειδὴ γὰρ οἱ ἱερεῖς οὐ πάντας ἴσασιν τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς, καὶ ἀνάξίως τῶν μυστηρίων μετίχοντας, ὁ Θεὸς πολλάκις τοῦτο ποιῶν, καὶ παραδίδωσιν αὐτοὺς τῷ Σατανῇ. ὅταν γὰρ νόσοι, ὅταν ἐπισυλῶναι, ὅταν πίνθη καὶ συμφορὰ συμβαίνωσιν, ὅταν ἀλλὰ τινα ταιαῦτα, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ Παῦλος δηλοῖ, οὕτως λήγων, Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς, καὶ ἄρρωστοι καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί."

Paul also intimates, saying, ‘For this cause many are sick and weak among you, and many sleep.’” Theodoret follows Chrysostom in his exposition: for, speaking of Hymenæus and Alexander, he says,^b “The apostle delivered them to Satan, as to a cruel executioner; for, being separated from the body of the Church, and left destitute of Divine grace, they were cruelly tormented by the adversary, falling into diseases, and sufferings, and other evils and calamities, which the devil is wont to inflict upon men.” Now this being the general sense of the ancients, both Greek and Latin, that this was an extraordinary apostolical power, distinct from the ordinary power of excommunication; we do not find that they ordinarily made use of this phrase, “delivering unto Satan,” in any of their forms of excommunication; as being sensible, that the Church, after the power of miracles was ceased, had no pretence to the power of inflicting bodily diseases, as the apostles had, upon excommunicate persons, by the ministry of Satan. Cassian, indeed, tells us,ⁱ “That he knew several holy men, that were corporally delivered to Satan; and to great infirmities for small offences.” But that was by the immediate hand of God, and his chastisements; and not by the censures of the Church, which did not excommunicate holy men, nor any others, for small offences. The author of the Life of St. Ambrose says also,^k “That he having to deal with a very flagitious sinner, said, ‘He ought to be delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that no one may dare to commit such things for the future.’ And he had no sooner spoken the word, but immediately, the very same moment, an unclean spirit seized the man, and began to tear him.” But this, if true, was a singular instance of apostolical and miraculous power yet remaining

^b Theodoret. in 1 Tim. i. 20. Τῷ διαβόλῃ . . . παρέδωκε τούτους ὡς δημίῳ πικρῷ . . . τοῦ γὰρ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ σώματος χωρισθέντες, καὶ τῆς θείας χάριτος γυμνωθέντες, πικρὰς παρὰ τοῦ δυσμενοῦς ἰδέχοντο μάστιγας, καὶ νόσους καὶ παθήμασι χαλίστοις περιπίπτοντες, καὶ ζημίαις καὶ συμφοραῖς ἰσχύαις. (Hal. 1771, iii. 646.)

ⁱ Cassian. Collat. vii. c. xxv. See before, note (*).

^k Paulin. Vit. Ambrosii. Quum deprehendisset auctorem tanti flagitii, ait, ‘Oportet illum tradi Satanæ in interitum carnis, ne talia aliquis in posterum audeat admittere.’ Quem eodem momento, quum adhuc sermo esset in ore sacerdotis, spiritus immundus arreptum discernere cœpit. (Paris. 1836, vol. i. p. xvi.)

in St. Ambrose; and there is scarce a parallel instance to be met with in all the history of the Church. The canons of old very rarely used this phrase. St. Basil mentions it once;¹ and Gratian cites an epistle of Pope Pelagius, where it is said,^m “By the example of apostolical authority, we have learned to deliver unto Satan erring spirits, which draw others into error, that they may learn not to blaspheme.” But in these places it seems to mean no more than excommunication or expulsion out of the Church, which is the spiritual delivering up to Satan, without any regard to bodily torture. For all men are sensible, that since the apostle’s days, there was no such power generally granted to the ministers of the Church. And for this reason, Peter du Moulin tells us,ⁿ the reformed Church of France, in their national synod of Alez, at which he himself assisted as moderator (an. 1629), made an order, “That, in excommunication, no one should use the form of ‘delivering unto Satan.’ Neither should the censure of *anathema maranatha* be pronounced against any man; forasmuch as no one ought to use that form, but he that knows the secrets of reprobation, and can tell, by the revelation of God’s Spirit, whether the person excommunicated has sinned against the Holy Ghost, or the sin unto death, that is, with such impenitency as will be final, and continue unto death; ‘for which,’ St. John says, ‘no one ought to pray.’” The prohibition here of the use of the form *anathema maranatha*, leads us to another inquiry, what the ancients understood by it; and whether they used it at any time as a form of excommunication?

¹ Basil. c. vii. Σχεδὸν γὰρ ὅλην γενεὰν ἀνθρώπου παριδόθησαν τῷ Σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδεύθωσι μὴ ἀσχημονεῖν.

^m Pelag. ap. Gratian. caus. xxiv. quæst. iii. c. xiii. Apostolicæ auctoritatis exemplo didicimus, errantium et in errorem mittentium spiritus tradendos esse Satanae, ut blasphemare dediscant.

ⁿ Molin. Vates, seu de Bonis Malisque Prophetis, lib. ii. c. xi. p. 114, (pp. 72, 73, edit. Gorinchem. 1672.) Prudenter cautum est, a synodo nationali Alensi, ne quis deinceps in excommunicationibus utatur hac loquendi formula, tradendi Satanae, nec vibret in quemquam *anathema maranatha*, . . . quæ ab eis solis vibrari potest, qui norunt arcana reprobationis, et Deo revelante sciunt, an qui excommunicatur, peccet in Spiritum Sanctum, aut peccato ad mortem, id est, impenitentia ad mortem usque duratura, pro quo peccato Joannes negat orandum esse.

SECT. XVI.—*What by Anathema Maranatha: and whether any such Forms of Excommunication were in Use in the Ancient Church.*

Anathema is a word that occurs frequently in the ancient canons, and the condemnation of all heretics. The Council of Gangra closes every one of its canons with the words ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, ‘let him be anathema,’ or ‘accursed;’ that is, separated from the communion of the Church and its privileges, and from the favour of God, without repentance, that goes against the tenour of the thing there decreed. And this is the style of most other councils, grounded upon that form of St. Paul: “If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be anathema, or accursed.” But the adding of *maranatha* to *anathema*, is not so common. There is little said of the word itself among the ancients, and less of its use in any form of excommunication.^o St. Chrysostom says,^p “It is a Hebrew word, signifying ‘the Lord is come:’” and he particularly applies it to the confusion of those who still abused the privileges of the Gospel, notwithstanding that the Lord was come among them. “This word,” says he, “speaks terror to those who make their members the members of a harlot, who offend their

^o Gratian. (caus. xxiii. quæst. iv. c. xxx.) mentionem ejus facit, tamquam usurpati in formula excommunicationis a Sylverio: Ego propterea non dimisi, nec omitto officium meum, sed cum episcopis, quos congregare potui, eos, qui talia erga me egerunt, anathematizavi, et una cum illis apostolica et synodali auctoritate statui, nullum umquam taliter decipiendum, sicut deceptus sum: et si aliquis deinceps ullum umquam episcoporum taliter deceperit; *anathemu maranatha* fieret in conspectu Dei et sanctorum angelorum.

^p Chrysostom. Hom. xlv. in 1 Cor. p. 717, (p. 488, edit. Francof.) Δι' ἰνὸς τούτου ῥήματος [ἀνάθεμα] πάντας ἰδέσῃς, τοὺς τὰ μίλη αὐτῶν ποιούντας πόρνης μίλη, τοὺς σκαιδαλίζοντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς διὰ τῶν ἰδωλοθύτων, τοὺς ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων ὀνομαζομένους, τοὺς τῇ ἀναστάσει διαπιστοῦντας. Μαριναθά' τίνας ἵνικιν τοῦτο εἴρηται; τί δήποτε καὶ Ἑβραῖδι φωνῇ; ἰπιδῇ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ὁ τύφος αἴτιος ἦν . . . Καταστέλλων αὐτῶν τὸν τύφον, οὐδὲ ἰλλάδι κίχρηται γλώσση, ἀλλὰ τῇ Ἑβραϊδι. . . . Τί δὲ ἴστι μαριναθά; ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἦλθε. τίνας δὲ ἵνικιν αὐτὸ τοῦτό φησι; τὸν τῆς οἰκονομίας βιβαιοῦν λόγον, ἐξ ᾧ μάλιστα τὰ σπέρματα τῆς ἀναστάσεως συντίθειν οὐ τοῦτο δι' ἰνόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰκίνοιντες ἰσπίσαν. ὥσαντι ἔλγιν, ὁ κοινὸς πάντων δισπίτης καταθένηαι τοσοῦτον κατηξίωσι, καὶ ὅμις ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἴστι, καὶ ἰπιμίντες ἀμαρτάνοντες.

brethren by eating things offered to idols, who name themselves by the names of men, who deny the resurrection. The Lord of all is come down among us; and yet ye continue the same men ye were before, and persevere in your sins." St. Jerom says,^a "It was more a Syriac than a Hebrew word, though it had something in it of both languages, signifying 'our Lord is come.'" But he applies it against the perverseness of the Jews, and others who denied the coming of Christ, making this the sense of the apostle: "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema: 'the Lord is come;'" wherefore it is superfluous for any to contend with pertinacious hatred against him, of the truth of whose coming there is such apparent demonstration. The same sense is given by Hilary the deacon, and Pelagius, who wrote under the names of St. Ambrose^r and St. Jerom:^s and it is received by Estius and Dr. Lightfoot as the truest interpretation. So that, according to this sense, *maranatha* could not be any part of the form of excommunication, but only a reason for pronouncing *anathema* against those who expressed their hatred against Christ, by denying his coming; either in words, as the Jews did, who blasphemed Christ, and called Jesus anathema, or accursed; or else by wicked works, as those who lived profanely, under the name of Christian.

Yet others of the ancients interpret it of the future coming of Christ: as St. Austin, who says,^t "*Maranatha* is a Syriac word, signifying 'the Lord will come.'" And he

^a Hieron. Epist. cxxxvii. ad Marcellam, (Venet. vol. i. p. 133.) *Maranatha* magis Syrum est quam Hebraicum, tametsi ex confinio utrarumque linguarum aliquid et Hebræum sonet, et interpretetur, 'Dominus noster venit;'^r ut sit sensus, 'Si quis non amat Dominum Jesum Christum, anathema sit,' et illo completo, deinceps inferatur, 'Dominus noster venit.' Quod superfluum sit adversus eum odiis pertinacibus velle contendere, quem venisse jam constet.

^r Ambros. in 1 Cor. xvi. *Maranatha* magis Syrum est quam Hebræum: tamen ex sermone utrarumque linguarum aliquid Hebræum sonat et interpretatur, 'Dominus noster venit.'

^s Hieron. in 1 Cor. xvi. Interpretatur, 'Dominus noster venit.'

^t Aug. Ep. clxxviii. sive altercatio cum Pascentio. *Anathema* Græco sermone dixit, 'condemnatus;' *Maranatha* definivit, 'Donec Dominus redeat.' . . . Non ergo recte dicitur Dominum amare, qui Domini et Dei unius audet substantiam separare, &c. (Antwerp. 1700, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 31.)

particularly applies it against the Arians, who could not be said to love the Lord, because they denied his Divine nature. Dr. Hammond, and many other modern interpreters, take *maranatha* in this sense," "The Lord will come to judgment:" as St. Jude says, "The Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all the ungodly." And they suppose this answered to the third and highest degree of excommunication among the Jews, called *shammatha*. "For," they say, "the Jews had three degrees of excommunication, — *niddui*, *cherem*, and *shammatha*. *Niddui* was the lowest degree of excommunication, being only a suspension of the sinner from the synagogue and society of his brethren for thirty days, if he repented; if not, the time was doubled to sixty days; and, if he still continued obstinate, it was prolonged to ninety days. Then, if he persisted impenitent still, he was punished with a more solemn excommunication, called *cherem*, which answers to *anathema*, or 'cursing,' because the sinner was cast out with solemn execrations out of the law of Moses. The third species, called *shammatha*, was the most severe, when a sinner, after all human means had in vain been tried upon him, was consigned over, totally and finally, to the Divine judgment, as a desperate and irrecoverable sinner. The word *shammatha* is, upon this account, said to signify, either, 'there is death;' or, 'there shall be desolation;' or, 'the Lord cometh:' which last origination of the word answers to *maranatha*. Now, from this analogy and similitude of the name, these learned men suppose this form of excommunication was taken into the Christian Church under the name of *maranatha*. But there is this grand objection against the thing, that Chrysostom, and St. Jerom, and the rest that have been mentioned, did not so understand it; besides, that there is no such word as *maranatha* ever occurs

* Poli Synops. Criticor. in 1 Cor. xvi. 22. Tres erant apud Judæos anathematis, sive excommunicationis species: 1. נִדְּוִי, *Niddui*, hoc est, 'profligatio,' a familiari consortio, ad 4 passus. 2. חֶרֶם, *Herem*, quod solemnus erat, cum execrationibus additis e lege Mosis, quo utebantur in eum, qui monitus non respiciebat. 3. שְׁמַתָּה, *Samatha*, quod heic *Maranatha*. Illud autem שְׁמַתָּה varie συμμελογίζουσι, vel 1. שָׁם מִיתָה, 'ibi mors:' vel 2. רָחַם שְׁמָמָה, 'erit desolatio:' vel 3. שֵׁם אֲרָה, 'Nomen,' i. e. Jehova, sive Dominus, 'venit.' — Otho, Lexic. pp. 180-182.

in any ancient form of excommunication. But still the question may be put further, Whether they had any such excommunication (be the name or form what it would), as was total, final, and irrevocable: so as utterly to exclude sinners from the communion of the Church, without hopes of recovery; and so as to make the Church wholly cease to pray for them, or rather pray that God would take them out of the world, and thereby deliver his Church from the malice of their attempts, and power of their seduction? This question consists of several parts, and therefore as it is proposed, so it must be answered, with some distinction. For, first, there is nothing more certain, than that the Church did sometimes pronounce a total, final, and irreversible sentence of excommunication, against some more heinous criminals, keeping them under penance all their lives, and denying them her external peace and communion at the hour of death, for example and terror; yet not precluding them the mercy of God, nor denying them the benefit of her prayers, but encouraging them to hope for favour, upon their true repentance, at God's final and unerring judgment. In this sense, I say, it is most certain the Church did many times make her sentence of excommunication irreversible, as will be shewed more fully hereafter.*

SECT. XVII. — *Whether Excommunication was ever pronounced with Execration, or devoting the Sinner to Temporal Destruction.*

But, secondly, it is not so apparent, that the Church was used to join execration to her censures, and devote men to temporal destruction, by utterly refusing to pray for them, or rather praying against them, that God would take them out of the world, and deliver his Church, by that means, from their malicious power, and machinations of seducement. Grotius^x thinks this was very rarely done, but, yet, that there are some examples of it: for, when Julian added to his apostasy devilish designs of rooting out the Christian

* Book xvii.

^x Grot. in Luc. vi. 22, (tom. ii. vol. i. p. 379, a.) Hujus sane rarior est usus; non tamen nullus. Nam in Julianum, cum defectioni adderet machinationes evertendi Christianismi, usa est ecclesia isto extremæ necessitatis telo, et a Deo est exaudita. (Groning. 1827, p. 251.)

religion, the Church used this weapon of extreme necessity, and God heard her prayers. He reckons this was done in imitation of the Jewish *shammatha*. "For among the Jews," he says, a little before, "if any fell into enormous crimes, and drew many after them, they did not use the common *anathema* against them, but that more dreadful and tremendous one, which they called *shammatha*: and the apostle after them, in the same sense, *maranatha*. For *maranatha* signifies 'the Lord cometh:' and by that word[†] prayer is made unto God, that he would speedily take away the malefactor and seducer out of the world." An example of which sort of *anathema*, he thinks, is given by the apostle (Gal. v. 12), when he says, "I would that they were even cut off that trouble you." The learned Dr. Hicks, in this matter, joins entirely with Grotius, seeing no other way to account for the many prayers made by the ancient Christians for Julian's destruction. Some, indeed, fasted and prayed for his repentance and conversion, as supposing he might be recovered from his error. Thus he tells us,[‡] out of Sozomen, how Didymus of Alexandria prayed for him. But others absolutely prayed for his destruction, as thinking him utterly incapable of repentance, and that he had sinned the sin unto death, for which it was in vain to pray. Then he goes on to shew the nature of his apostasy, his devotedness to the devil, and his spite to Christ and the Christians: from whence he concludes[§] it was reasonable for the Christians to look upon him as irrecoverable out of the snare of the devil, and upon that supposition to pray for his destruction. He adds several other arguments to shew the reasonableness of their presumption, that Julian had a diabolical malice^b against Christ, and that he was one of

[†] Grot. in Luc. vi. 22, (tom. ii. vol. i. p. 379, a.) Ea voce oratur Deus, ut quamprimum talem maleficum et seductorem tollat ex hominum numero. Hujus anathematis exemplum est, Gal. v. 12. (Groning. 1827, p. 249.)

[‡] Hick's Answer to Julian, chap. vi. p. 140, ex Sozom. lib. vi. c. ii. (Vales. p. 518.) Κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ Δίδυμος, ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς φιλόσοφος, ἐν Ἀλεξ-ανδρείᾳ διατρέφων, οἷά γι τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν θρησκίαν διασφαλίντος, περιλυτός ὢν, διὰ τι αὐτὸν ὡς πικρανημίον, καὶ διὰ τὴν καταφρόνησιν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἐήστυί τε, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν περὶ τούτου ἐκείναι.

[§] Ibid. p. 143.

Ibid. p. 151.

those irrecoverable apostates, who had trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and who had done despite to the Spirit of grace. He had hardened his heart against Divine miracles, like Pharaoh; and therefore it is no wonder, if some of them^c called for the plagues of Egypt upon him. He reproached the living God, like Sennacherib: and that made some of them, like Hezekiah, to beseech God^d to bow down his ear and hear, and to open his eyes and see, how Julian reproached the Son of God; and thereupon to say, "O Lord, our God, we beseech thee to save us out of his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou art the Lord God; and that Jesus, whom Julian doth so reproach, is thy Son and Christ." Gregory says,^e "He designed worse things against the Christians than Diocletian, Maximian, or Maximinus, ever did; that he was Jeroboam, Pharaoh, Ahab, and Nebuchadnezzar, all in one; Jeroboam in apostasy, Pharaoh in hardness of heart, Ahab in cruelty, and Nebuchadnezzar in sacrilege; and, therefore, it is not to be wondered, that the Christians, who had such good reason to despair of the conversion of such a complicate tyrant, prayed for his destruction, because there was no other apparent way of delivering the Church. And if it should please God, for our sins, to plague the Church with such a spiteful enemy of Christ, and suffer a popish Julian, indeed, to reign over us, I here declare," says he, "that I should believe him incapable of repentance; and upon that supposition should be tempted to

^c Nazianz. Orat. Invect. iv. *Τὴν ῥομφαίαν τι περιπαλούμεθα, καὶ τὰς Αἰγυπτιακὰς μάστιγας, καὶ δικάσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δίκην ἤξιοῦμεν, καὶ διαναστῆναι ποτὶ διικλινόμεθα κατὰ τῶν ἀσέλγων. κ. τ. λ.* (Colon. 1690, vol. i. p. 124.)

^d Ibid. pp. 123, 124.

^e Ibid. Orat. Invect. p. 93. "Ἄ μήτι Διοκλητιανὸς ὁ πρῶτος ἐνυβρίσας Χριστιανοίς, μήτι ὁ ταῦτον ἐκδιξάμενος, καὶ ὑπερβαλὼν Μαξιμιανὸς, ἐνιδυμήθη πάσσοις, μήτι Μαξιμῖνος, ὁ μιστ' ἐκείνους καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκείνους διώκτης. . . . ταῦτα ἐκείνος δινοῦντο μὲν, ὡς οἱ τῶν ἀποβήσαντων ἐκείνου κοινωνοὶ, καὶ μάστιγες.—Orat. iv. p. 110, D. Ἱεροδοτὴμ εἰπίειν, εἰκισίον, ἢ Ἀχαιὸς τὸν Ἰσραηλίστην, τοὺς παρανοματάτους, ἢ Φαραὼ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, ἢ Ναβουχοδονόσορ τὸν Ἀσσύριον, ἢ πάντα ταῦτα συνιόντας, ἵνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὀνομάσωμεν ἰσὶ καὶ τὰς πάντων κακίας εἰς ἑαυτὸν συλλεξάμενος φαίνεται, Ἱεροδοτὴμ τὴν ἀποστασίαν, Ἀχαιὸς τὴν μαυφονίαν, Φαραὼ τὴν σκληρότητα, Ναβουχοδονόσορ τὴν ἱεροσυλίαν, πάντων ἰμοῦ τὴν ἀσίλειαν."

pray for his destruction as the only means of delivering the Church. Thus far that learned man, in his account of the practice of the primitive Christians, and their reasons in praying for the destruction of Julian the Apostate.

To this may be added what St. Jerom says upon the death of Julian,^f “That the Church of Christ, with exultation, sung her thanks to God, in the words of the prophet, according to the Septuagint, ‘Thou hast, even to our astonishment, divided the heads of the powerful.’” Which is also noted by Theodoret, who says,^g “The people of Antioch, as soon as they heard of Julian’s death, kept public feasts and holydays for joy; and not only in their churches, but in their theatres, proclaimed the victory of the cross, exposing the heathen prophecies to ridicule, particularly those of one Maximus, a magician, whom he had consulted. O foolish Maximus, where are now thy prophecies? God and his Christ have overcome.” So, again, he tells us^h of one Julianus Saba, who had it revealed to him in his prayers that Julian was slain: “Upon which he immediately changed his tears into joy, and put on a cheerful countenance, expressing the inward satisfaction of his mind. Which the bystanders observing, desired to know the reason of his sudden change: and he told them, ‘That the wild boar, who laid waste the vineyard of the Lord, had now suffered punishment for all the injuries he had done against the Lord; that he now lay

^f Hieron. in Habac. iii. 14. Ecclesia Christi cum exultatione cantavit: ‘Divisisti in stupore capita potentium.’ (Venet. vi. p. 660, D.)

^g Theodoret. lib. iii. c. xxviii. (Vales. p. 147.) Ἀντιόχου πόλις τὴν ἐκείνου μεμαθηκυῖα σφαγῇ, δημοθείας ἐπιτίλει καὶ πανηγύρις· καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἔχουσιν καὶ τοῖς μαρτύρων σηκοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς διατείροις τοῦ σταυροῦ τὴν νίκην ἐκέρυττον, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου μαντιύμασιν ἐπιτάβαζον . . . Καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἰδόν, Ποῦ σου τὰ μαντεῖα, Μάξιμε μαγεί· ἐνίκησεν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ.

^h Ibid. c. cxiv. p. 145, C. Κατ’ ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν, καθ’ ἣν ἐκείνος ἰδέσκατο τὴν σφαγῇ, οὗτος ταύτην προσευχόμενος ἔγνω . . . Φασι δὲ αὐτὸν ποσινώμενον καὶ τὸν φιλένθρωπον ἀντιβελούτα διαπόνην, ἰσισχύν μὴν ἑαπάνης τὴν τῶν δακρύων φορὰν διαχυθῆναι δὲ καὶ θυμῷ πλῆσθῆναι, καὶ γυνώσκειν τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ τοῦτο μνησθῆναι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἡδονήν ταύτην οἱ συνηθίσταται τὴν μεταβολὴν αὐτοῦ διασέμενοι, μνησθῆναι σφίσι ἐκείνους τῆς εὐφροσύνης τὴν ἀφορμὴν· ὁ δὲ τὸν εὖν ἔφη τὸν ἄγγελον, τὸν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τοῦ Θεοῦ πολίτην, δικὰς ἐσπιτῆραι τῶν εἰς τοῦτον ἀδικημάτων, καὶ κτεῖσθαι κερὸν, τῆς ἐκβουλῆς πτωχεύειν ταῦτα μεμαθηκυῖας ἔχουσιν ἄπαντες, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν χαριστήριον προσέφθιεν ὕμνον.

dead, and they needed no longer to be afraid of his designs against them.' Upon which they all leaped for joy, and sung praises to God for the victory." Now it is probable, that they who thought it their duty thus to give God thanks for his fall, were no less solicitous beforehand to pray for his destruction: their thanksgivings were a declaration what sort of prayers they had made; and they could not but rejoice when they were heard and answered. It is some confirmation of all this, that Socrates says,¹ "They were used sometimes to cast men out of the Church with execration, as he notes of one Hermogenes, a Novatian bishop, who, for some blasphemous books which he had written, was solemnly excommunicated, μετὰ κατάρας, 'with cursing,'" which, in all probability, denoted something more than the common anathema that accompanied every excommunication.

It is also noted by Socrates (lib. i. c. 37), that Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, prayed thus against Arius:^k "If the doctrine of Arius be true, let me die before the day appointed for our disputation; but, if the faith which I hold be true, and the doctrine of Arius false, let Arius, by the time determined, suffer the punishment which his impiety deserves." Which was accordingly fulfilled: for Arius, the next day, voided his entrails with his excrements, and so perished by a most ignominious death. The same is related by Athanasius, in his Epistle to Serapion (tom. i. p. 671), who says,^l "He prayed to God in these words, Ἄρον Ἀρείον, 'Take Arius out of the world.'" All which shews, that in some special cases they made no scruple to devote very malicious and incorrigible apostates to extermination and destruction.

¹ Socrat. lib. vii. c. xii. (Vales. p. 284, C.) Ἐρμογίνης, ὃς ἐπὶ βλασφημίαις συγγράμμασιν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ κατάρας ἐκκλήρυκτο.

^k Ibid. lib. i. c. xxxvii. (Vales. p. 61, C.) Ἡ αἵτησις ἦν τοιαύτη, εἰ μὲν ἀληθὴς ἡ Ἀρείου δόξα, ἑαυτὸν τὴν ὡρισμένην ἡμέραν τῇ συζητήσει μὴ ὄψισθαι· εἰ δὲ, ἦν αὐτὸς ἔχει πίστιν, ἀληθὴς, Ἀρείον τῆς ἀσεβείας δίκην δίδοναι, τὸν πάντων αἰτίων τῶν κακῶν. — Cap. xxxviii. Ἀμα τοῖς διαχωρήμασιν ἡ ἰδρα τόσι παραυτίκα ἐκπίπτει, καὶ αἵματος πλῆθος ἰσηκολούθει, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐντέρων συνίτριχε δι' αἷμα αὐτῶ σπληνὶ τι καὶ ἥπατι. (P. 62, A.)

^l Athan. Epist. ad Serap. tom. i. p. 671, (p. 341. edit. Paris. 1698.)

Yet, on the other hand, St. Chrysostom was utterly against this practice: for he has a whole homily upon this point,^m “That men ought not to anathematize either the living or the dead; they may anathematize their opinions or actions, but not their persons.” Where, as Grotiusⁿ rightly observes, “He takes anathema, in the strictest sense, for praying to God for the destruction of the sinner.” Against this he argues from these several topics: 1. “Because Christ died for all men, for his enemies, for tyrants, for magicians, for those that hated and crucified him.^o 2. Because the Church, in imitation of Christ, daily prays for all men.^p 3. Because the Christian religion rather obliges us to lay down our own lives for our neighbours, than take away theirs.^q 4. It is usurping upon the prerogative of Christ: for what is such an anathema but saying, ‘Let him be given to the devil; let him have no place of salvation; let him be separated from Christ? Who gave thee this authority and power? Why dost thou assume the dignity of the Son of God, who shall sit in ‘judgment, and set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left?’ 5. The apostles had no such practice in excommunication: they cast heretics out of the Church,^s in such manner as one would pluck out a right eye, or cut off a limb, with indications of compassion

^m Chrysostom. Hom. lxxvi. de Anathemate, tom. i. p. 808, edit. Francof. Τὰ αἰρετικὰ δόγματα τὰ παρ’ ὧν παρὶλάβομεν ἀναθεματίζειν χρεὶ, καὶ τὰ ἀσθεῖ δόγματα ἰλίγγυν, πᾶσαν δὲ φιδῶ ἀνθρώπων ποιῆσθαι, καὶ εὐχισθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας. (913, D.)

ⁿ Grot. in Luc. vi. 32.

^o Chrysostom. Hom. lxxvi. tom. i. p. 909, C. (p. 804.) Οὐχ ὑπὲρ φίλων μόνων καὶ ἰδίων ἀποθανόντων, ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ ἰχθρῶν, ὑπὲρ τυράννων, ὑπὲρ γοήτων, ὑπὲρ μισούντων, ὑπὲρ τῶν σταυρουσάντων.

^p Ibid. Τούτων τοὺς τύπους ἡ ἐκκλησία πληροῖ, καθ’ ἑκάστην ὑπὲρ πάντων τὰς ἰουστῆρας ποιουμένη. (909, D.)

^q Ibid. (p. 801, edit. Francof.) Ἐκτὶ φησιν, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν. ἰναυτὰ δὲ καὶ θῆσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πλησίου. (908, D.)

^r Ibid. p. 805. Τί οὖν ἴσται, ὁ λίγυς ἀνάθημα; ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἀναθίσθω οὗτος διαβόλη, καὶ μηκέτι χώρει σωτηρίας ἰχίτω, γινίσθω ἀλλότῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ τίς εἰ σὺ ταύτης τῆς ἔξουσίας καὶ τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως; τότε γὰρ καθίσαι Τίος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ στήσῃ τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν, τὰ δὲ ἐρίφια ἐξ ἐναντίων. (910, A.)

^s Ibid. Ὡς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τὸν δεξιὸν ἐξορύττοντες, οὕτω τοὺς αἰρετικούς ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπέβαλον· ὅπερ ἰδούμην ἔχει τῆς μεγάλης αὐτῶν συμπαθείας καὶ ἀλγυθόνος, ὡς ἱπικαίριον μίλουσιν ἀπονοσῆς. . . . Τὰς μὲν αἰρίσεις διήλιγγον καὶ ἀπέβαλον, οὐδὲν δὲ τούτων τῶν αἰρετικῶν ταύτην ἱπικιμίαν προσήγον.

and sorrow : they carefully rebuked and expelled their heresies, but did not thus anathematize their persons. 6. It is an absurd practice, whether it be used toward the living or the dead. If toward the living,^t thou art cruel in cutting off one, who is still in a capacity of turning and changing his life from evil to good ; if toward the dead, thou art more cruel ; because, now, to his own Master he stands or falls, and is not under any human power." From all this he concludes,^u that we ought only to anathematize the impious and heretical opinions of men, but to spare their persons, and pray for their salvation. There are some who make a question, Whether this be one of St. Chrysostom's genuine discourses ? but without any good reason ; because the matter and style, as Du Pin observes, argue it to be his : and there are other arguments to prove it genuine. Sixtus Senensis^x and Habertus^y think, he speaks only against private men's using the anathema against heretics ; but, it is plain, he argues against the public as well as private use of it, in the sense wherein he takes it, that doctrines, and not men, are to be anathematized. We are to pray for the persons of heretics, when we condemn their opinions ; and desire their conversion and salvation, not their destruction. The only thing that can truly be inferred from hence is, that St. Chrysostom had different sentiments about this matter from some others. They thought there were some cases in which it was

^t Chrysostom. Hom. lxxvi. tom. i. p. 805. "Ἡ γὰρ ζῇ καὶ παρέσται· ἐν τῷ θνήσκῃ βίῃ τούτῳ, ἢ τίθησκιν, ἐν ἀναθεματίζειν προήρησαι· εἰ μὴν εὖν· ἔτι περισσύν, ἀσέβεις ἀποκόπτων τὸν ἐν τριπτότητι ὄντα, καὶ μετατιθῆναι δυνάμενον ἐκ τοῦ κακοῦ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. εἰ δὲ τίθησκιν, πολλῶ μᾶλλον· σί δήποτε ; ἔτι τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρτῷ στήκει ἢ πίπτει, οὐκ εἰς ὑπὸ ἔξουσίαν ἀνθρώπου συγχέων. (913, A. B.)

^u See note (m).

^x Sixt. Senens. Bibl. lib. vi. Annotat. cclxvii. Quum tot locis Chrysostomus excommunicationis ecclesiasticæ auctoritatem defendat, verisimile non est, ut mutata sententia voluerit eam hoc loco damnare ; sed hoc magis credendum est, eum hanc homiliam protulisse adversus quosdam temerarios et indoctos, qui quum non essent ecclesiæ pastores, nec ullam haberent excommunicandi potestatem, tamen odio et contentione inducti dogmata, ab ipsis non intellecta, cum auctoribus eorum temere damnabant, et anathemate notabant.

^y Habert. Archieratic. p. 747. Multa S. Chrysostom. Homil. de Anathemate, ubi anathema cuique dici improbat : sed a privatis primo : et ab idiotis, ut ibidem exprimit : deinde cum odio in personas ipsas et cum dispendio caritatis.

lawful to pray for the destruction of very malicious and incorrigible sinners, such as Julian, when they were past all hopes, and there was no other visible way to save the Church from their hellish designs, but by their destruction. He thought there was no such case, but that every man was capable of pardon so long as he lived in this world, even though he had committed what others call the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, and the sin unto death, of which he had a different notion from what some others had ; and, therefore, that we were to pray for every man's conversion, and not his destruction. This, as far as I can judge, was the different sense which the ancients had upon this most difficult matter ; and, if they varied upon the point in so nice a case, it is not much to be wondered at, since the moderns are not agreed upon it; but some Churches, as I shewed before out of Du Moulin, forbid all such sorts of excommunications, as unfit to be used without a particular revelation. I have stated the matter fairly on both sides, and leave the determination to the liberty and discretion of every judicious reader.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE OBJECTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL CENSURES, OR THE PERSONS ON WHOM THEY MIGHT BE INFLICTED: WITH A GENERAL ACCOUNT OF THE CRIMES FOR WHICH THEY WERE INFLICTED.

SECT. I.—*All Members of the Church, falling into great and scandalous Crimes, made liable to Ecclesiastical Censures, without Exception.*

HAVING thus far explained the nature of ecclesiastical censures, and the several kinds of them, we are next to consider the objects or persons on whom they might be inflicted, and the crimes for which they were inflicted on them. As to the persons or objects of ecclesiastical censure, they were all such delinquents as fell into great and scandalous crimes

after baptism, whether men or women, priests or people, rich or poor, princes or subjects : for the ecclesiastical discipline made no distinction, save when the multitude of sinners, combining together, made it impossible to put Church-censures in execution, or made it hazardous, for fear of doing more harm than good by the strict execution of them. Infidels and unbelievers were not considered in this matter, as being no members of the Church, according to that rule of the apostle (1 Cor. v. 12), “What have I to do to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without, God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.” Catechumens were in a middle state between heathens and Christians, only candidates of baptism, and not yet admitted to full communion by the laver of regeneration and adoption of children: and, therefore, neither were they the proper objects of Church-discipline, save only as they were capable of being thrust down into a lower class of their own order, if they committed any crime deserving such a degradation; of which I have given some account already,^a in speaking of the institution of the catechumens. Here we take discipline, as respecting only those that were called the τέλειοι, ‘perfect communicants,’ or persons in full communion with the Church.

SECT. II.—*Women as well as Men.*

In censuring these, the Church made no distinction of sex or quality. For women were subjected to discipline, as well as men. Valesius says, they were very rarely put to do public penance;^b and Bona says,^c “Never at all for the three first ages; but they wept, and fasted, and did other works of repentance, in private.” And some take that canon

^a Book x. chap. ii. sect. xvii.

^b Vales. in Socrat. lib. v. c. xix. p. 53, B. Raro mulieres ad publicam pœnitentiam cogebantur.

^c Bon. Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. xvii. n. v. p. 400. Mulieribus numquam publica pœnitentia, saltem primis ecclesiæ sæculis, imponi solebat; sed privatim flebant, jejunabant, et alia pœnitentiæ opera exercebant. (Antwerp. 1677.)

of St. Basil in this sense, where he says,^d "If a woman was convicted of adultery, or confessed it herself, by the ancient rules, she was not to be made a public example," *δημοσιεύειν οὐκ ἐκώλυσαν οἱ πατέρες*. But Cyprian, and Tertullian, and the ancient canons, make no such distinction: neither is it probable, that when multitudes, both of men and women, fell openly into idolatry in times of persecution, that the one did public, and the other private penance only. For Cyprian never speaks of any but the public *exomologesis*, or 'confession,' and public imposition of hands,^e to reconcile penitents again after lapsing: and yet there it had been proper to have made the distinction between men and women, if he had known of any such distinction in the practice of the Church. But whether their penance was public or private, the case is still the same as to the exercise of discipline upon them. For they were certainly excluded from communion, and that sometimes for many years, and, in some cases, even to the hour of death, as appears from many canons^f of the

^d Basil. c. xxxiv. Τὰς μοιχιυθείσας γυναῖκας, καὶ ἱεραγορευούσας δι' ἐνλάβειαν, ἢ ὁπωσούν ἡλιγχεύμεναι, δημοσιεύειν μὴ ἐκώλυσαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. (Labb. ii. 1741.)

^e Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 137, (p. 97, edit. Amstelod.) Agite pœnitentiam plenam; dolentis ac lamentantis animi probate mœstitiā. Nec vos quorundam moveat aut error improvidus, aut stupor vanus, qui quum teneantur in tam grandi crimine, percussi sunt animi cœcitate, ut nec intelligant delicta, nec plangent. . . . Injuste sibi placentes, et transpunctæ mentis alienatione dementes, Domini præcepta contemnunt, medelam vulneris negligunt, agere pœnitentiam nolunt. Ante admissum facinus improvidi, post facinus obstinati; nec prius stabiles, nec postmodum supplices: quando debuerant stare jacerunt: quando jacere . . . debent, stare se opinantur, &c.—Id. Ep. x. al. xvi. (p. 195, edit. Amstelod.) Quum in minoribus peccatis agant peccatores pœnitentiam justo tempore, et secundum disciplinæ ordinem ad exomologesin veniant, et per manus impositionem episcopi et cleri jus communicationis accipiant: nunc crudo tempore, persecutione adhuc perseverante, nondum restituta ecclesiæ ipsius pace, ad communicationem admittuntur, et offertur nomen eorum, et nondum pœnitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illis datur. &c. (Oxon. 1682, p. 37.)

^f Conc. Iliber. c. v. (Labb. i. p. 971.) Si qua domina, furore zeli accensa, flagris verberaverit ancillam suam, ita ut in tertium diem animam cum cruciatu effundat; eo quod incertum sit, voluntate, an casu occiderit; si voluntate, post septem annos; si casu, post quinquennii tempora, acta legitima pœnitentia, ad communionem placuit admitti.—Can. viii. p. 971. Feminae, quæ, nulla præcedente causa, reliquerint viros suos, et se copulaverint alteris, nec in fine accipiant communionem.—Can. x. Quod si ducitur ab eo, qui inculpatam reliquit uxorem, et eum sciverit habere uxorem, quam sine causa reliquit; placuit, nec

Councils of Eliberis, Ancyra,^g and others. And this is a sufficient indication of their being liable to ecclesiastical censure, as well as men. Nay, there are some undeniable instances of women doing public penance, as Bona owns, in the time of St. Jerom: for he, speaking of Fabiola, a rich Roman lady, who had divorced herself from her first husband for adultery, and married a second, says,^h “ That after the death of the second husband, when she came to consider the unlawfulness of the fact, she put on sackcloth, and made public confession of her error in the Lateran Church, in the sight of all the people of Rome; standing in the order of penitents in Lent, and in a penitent garb, with her hair dissolved, and her cheeks wan with tears, submitting her neck to imposition of hands; the bishop, and presbyters, and all the people weeping with her.” This seems to have been a voluntary act of penance (as there were many such in those days, when men chose to expiate even private crimes by public penance): but if it had not been customary at all for women to do public penance, St. Jerom would have noted the singularity of it in that respect, rather than any other. But he seems to place the singularity of it in this, that she condescended, of her own accord, to do public penance in a case where no laws of the Church could have obliged her to it. For whilst her husband lived, no constraint could be laid upon her: ⁱ it being a rule not to admit married persons to public penance, without consent of both parties: and

in fine hujus dari communionem.—Can. xii. Mater, vel parens, vel quælibet fidelis, si lenocinium exercuerint, eo quod alienum vendiderint corpus, vel potius suum, placuit, eas nec in fine accipere communionem. See also, can. xiii. xiv. lxiii. lrv.

^g Conc. Ancy. c. xxi. (Labb. i. 1464.) Περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν τῶν ἡγορευουσῶν, καὶ ἀναιρουσῶν τὰ γυνώμινα, καὶ σπουδαζουσῶν φθόρια ποιῶν, ὃ μὲν πρότερος ἦτος μίχρης ἔξοδον ἰκάλουσιν καὶ αὐτὰ συντίθενται· φιλανθρωπότεροι δὲ τι ὑβρίζοντες, ἀρίσταμιν δικαιοῦν χρόνοι κατὰ τοὺς βαθμοὺς τοὺς ἐρισμίνους.

^h Hieron. Ep. xxx. Epitaph. Fabiolæ, (Venet. vol. i. p. 459, E.) Quis hoc crederet, ut post mortem secundi viri in semet ipsam reversa . . . saccum indueret, ut errorem publice fateretur; et tota urbe spectante Romana, ante diem Paschæ in Basilica quondam Laterani . . . staret in ordine pœnitentium, episcopo, presbyteris, et omni populo collacrymantibus, sparsum crinem, ora lurida, squalidas manus, sordida colla submitteret?

ⁱ Conc. Arelat. II. c. xxii. Pœnitentiam conjugatis non nisi ex consensu dandam.

when her husband was dead, her crime perhaps was one of that nature which did not directly bring her under the power of ecclesiastical censure, but by her own consent. For, as we shall see more by and by, there were many crimes of that nature, which, though allowed to be sins of no mean size, yet could not bring men, against their wills, to a course of public penance, by any laws of the Church.

SECT. III.—*The Rich as well as the Poor. No Commutation of Penance allowed, nor Friendship, nor Favour.*

But where the crimes were flagrant, and such as the Church could take cognizance of, there she usually proceeded, without respect of persons. No regard was had to the rich more than the poor, but all criminals were considered alike, in the business of repentance, as equally obliged to comply with the stated rules of discipline, in order to gain admission into the Church after an expulsion. There was but one door of re-entry, which is so often called *justa et legitima pœnitentia*, 'the just and legal penance,' by Cyprian¹ and other writers: and no commutation was thought an equivalent, where this was wanting. Which is evident from this, that they would not accept any gifts or oblations from excommunicate persons, or heretics, or schismatics, or any that were not in full communion with the Church,^k lest this should look like communicating with them before their time, and receiving their money in lieu of repentance. Cyprian, indeed, once intimates,^l that there were some who, for filthy lucre, were inclined to accept persons; and who, to make a

¹ Cyprian. Ep. x. al. xvi. p. 37, (p. 195.) See before, note (*).—Id. Ep. lxiii. al. iv. p. 9, (p. 174.) Si de eis aliqua corrupta fuerit deprehensa, agat pœnitentiam plenam, quia quæ hoc crimen admisit, non mariti sed Christi adultera est, et ideo æstimato justo tempore, postea exomologesi facta, ad ecclesiam redeat.—Id. de Lapsis, p. 129, (p. 97.) Agite pœnitentiam plenam, &c.—Conc. Illiber. c. xiv. (Labbe. i. 972.) . . . Si alios cognoverint viros, eo quod mœchata sint, placuit, per quinquennii tempora, acta legitima pœnitentia, admitti eas ad communionem oportere.—Can. iii. Placuit, in fine eis præstari communionem, acta tamen legitima pœnitentia.

^k See chap. ii. sect. xiii. and book xv. chap. ii. sect. ii.

^l Cyprian. Epist. xi. al. xv. ad Martyr. p. 35, (p. 194, edit. Amstelod.) Qui personas accipientes in beneficiis vestris aut gratificantur, aut illicitæ negotiationis nundinas aucupantur.

market of unlawful gain, would gratify the rich, and those who could give large gifts, to get them an easier way of admittance than by the severe and tedious way of a just and full penance: but he very sharply inveighs against these and all their sinister arts of dissolving discipline, and ruining men's souls, under pretence of granting them a fallacious and deceitful peace, which was their real destruction.

SECT. IV. — *What Privilege some claimed upon the Intercession of the Martyrs in Prison for them. And how this was answered by Cyprian.*

One of these insidious arts, which they managed with some colour and dexterity, was to get the martyrs and confessors in prison to intercede with bishops for such, and write letters in their favour. For we must know, that anciently the martyrs were allowed this privilege, when any penitent had wellnigh performed his legal penance, and was near upon being received again, to write letters to the bishop, that such a one might be admitted to communion, though his full term of penance was not quite expired. And so far their petition was commonly accepted. But these crafty men, for a little underhand gain, had got a trick to desire the martyrs to intercede for such as had done little or no penance: nay, they abused their privilege so far, as peremptorily to require the admission of such without any previous examination of their merits: and sometimes they required the bishop, not only to admit such a penitent, but all that belonged to him; which was a very uncertain and blind sort of petition, and created great envy to the bishop, when perhaps twenty, or thirty, or a greater number of nameless persons, were included in one libel,^m and the bishop was forced to do a very ungrateful office, and deny them altogether. Cyprian complains much of these abuses, both in his letter to the martyrs, and in others written upon the

^m Cyprian. Epist. xi. al. xv. ad Martyr. (p. 194, edit. Amstelod.) Audio quibusdam sic libellos fieri, ut dicatur, 'Communicet ille cum suis.' Quod numquam omnino a martyribus factum est, ut incerta et cæca petitio invidiam nobis postmodum cumulet: late enim patet, quando dicitur, 'Ille cum suis;' et possunt nobis viceni et triceni et amplius offerri, qui propinqui et adfines, et liberti ac domestici esse adseverentur ejus, qui accipit libellum. (Oxon. 1682, p. 35.)

same subject to his clergy and people.ⁿ But chiefly he complains of those libels, which were sent to him by Lucian the martyr, one of which runs in this form :^o “All the confessors, to Cyprian the bishop, greeting : know that we have granted peace to all those of whom you have had an account how they have behaved themselves since the commission of their crimes : and we would that these presents should be notified by you to the rest of the bishops. We wish you to maintain peace with the holy martyrs.” This Lucian had written many such letters before, in the name of Paulus the confessor, whilst he was in prison, and others after his death, saying, “He had his command so to do.” All which Cyprian complains of in a letter to the clergy of Rome,^p as a thing dissolving all the bands of faith, and the fear of God, and the commandments of the Lord, and the holiness and vigour of the Gospel ; and as creating great envy to the bishops, whilst they were forced to deny to lapsers, what they boasted to have obtained of the martyrs and confessors. “This occasioned,” he says, “great seditions and tumults ; for in

ⁿ Cyprian. Epist. x. al. xvi. ad Cler. tot. — Epist. xii. al. xvii. ad Plebem tota. — Epist. xviii. al. xxvi. ad Cler. tot.

^o Lucian. Epist. ad Cyprian. xvii. al. xxiii. (p. 49.) Universi confessores Cypriano Papæ salutem. Scias nos universis, de quibus apud te ratio constiterit, quid post commissum egerint, dedisse pacem : et hanc formam per te et aliis episcopis innotescere volumus. Optamus te cum sanctis martyribus pacem habere. — See also Lucian. Epist. xx. al. xxii. ad Celerin.

^p Cyprian. Epist. xxiii. al. xxvii. ad Cler. Rom. (p. 206, edit. Amstelod.) Postquam ad eos litteras misi, ut quasi moderatius aliquid et temperantius fieret, universorum confessorum nomine Lucianus epistolam scripsit, qua pene omne vinculum fidei, et timor Dei, et mandatum Domini, et evangelii sanctitas et firmitas solveretur. Scripsit enim, omnium nomine, universis eos pacem dedisse ; et hanc formam per me aliis episcopis innotescere velle, cujus epistolæ exemplum ad vos transmisi. Additum est plane : de quibus ratio constiterit, quid post commissum egerint. Quæ res majorem conflât invidiam, ut nos quum singulorum causas audire et excutere cœperimus, videamur multis negare, quod se nunc omnes jactant a martyribus et confessoribus accepisse. . . . In provincia nostra per aliquot civitates in præpositos impetus per multitudinem factus est, et pacem, quam semel cuncti a martyribus et confessoribus datam clamitabant, confestim sibi repræsentari cœgerunt ; territis et subactis præpositis suis, qui ad resistendum minus virtute animi et robore fidei prævalebant. Apud nos etiam quidam turbulenti, qui vix a nobis in præteritum regebantur, et in nostram præsentiam differebantur, per hanc epistolam, velut quibusdam facibus accensi, plus exardescere et pacem sibi datam extorquere cœperunt. (Oxon. 1682, p. 52.)

many cities throughout the province of Carthage, the people rose up in multitudes against their bishops, and, by their clamours, compelled them to grant them instantly that peace which, they all said, the martyrs and confessors had given them : they who had not courage enough, and strength of faith, to resist them, were, by this means, terrified and subdued into a compliance with them." And he had much ado himself to withstand them at Carthage : "For some turbulent men, who were hardly governable before, and thought it much to be kept back from communion till he returned out of exile, when they had gotten these letters of the martyrs, were all in a flame upon the strength of them, and began to rage immoderately, and, in an extorting manner, demand the peace which, they said, the martyrs had granted them."

By this representation of Cyprian, and his remonstrance upon it, it is easy to discern what mischief the abusing this privilege of the martyrs did to the true exercise of discipline; whilst some out of lucre, others out of terror, complied with the lapsers' unreasonable demands, and let the rich and the great escape punishment, and intrude themselves into the communion of the Church again, without any sufficient evidences of repentance : but they who, like Cyprian, had integrity and firmness enough to oppose these impious practices, kept up the discipline of the Church in its true vigour, and would hearken to no pretences or conditions of this kind, which only tended to impose upon them with false shows of a deceitful peace, and profane the mystery of the holy sacrament, by giving it to the impenitent and the ungodly.

SECT. V.—*Magistrates and Princes subject to Ecclesiastical Censures, as well as any others.*

Neither was it only men in a private condition they thus treated, but also those of the highest rank and dignity : for the civil magistrates and princes were subject to ecclesiastical censures, as well as any others. In the times of persecution, the very taking of some civil offices made Christians liable to excommunication : particularly if they

took upon them the office of the *duumviri*, or the provincial office of the *flamines*, or *sacerdotes provinciarum*; because, as Gothofred¹ shews out of many laws of the Theodosian Code, these offices obliged them to exhibit the usual games or shows to the people; which, in time of heathenism, could not be done without involving them, in some measure, in the guilt of idolatry, to which these games were consecrated. For which reason, any Christian undertaking such an office was reputed an encourager and partaker of idolatry, though he did not actually sacrifice to idols in his office. Upon which account the Council of Eliberis, which was held in time of persecution (an. 305, or thereabouts), orders,² "That if any Christian took upon him the office of a *flamen*, though he did not sacrifice, but only exhibit the idolatrous shows to the people, he should be kept under strict penance all his life, and only be admitted to communion at his death: and that in consideration that he had abstained from offering the abominable sacrifices." For, if he had offered sacrifice, then, by the preceding canon,³ he was denied communion to the very last. Nay, though they had neither sacrificed, nor exhibited the shows, out of their expense to the people, but only worn the crown in their office, by two other canons⁴ of the same council they were to be denied the communion for a year or two. So that the being in a public office was so far from exempting a magistrate from the censures of the Church, that, in many cases, it was the very reason why they were executed with greater severity upon him, whilst no man could go through such an office without the guilt and stain of idolatry in some measure sticking to him. And

¹ Gothofred. Paratitlon ad Cod. Theod. lib. xv. tit. v. de Spectaculis. Edebantur spectacula vel a magistratibus. 1. Duumviris . . . seu a curiarum primatibus viris. . . . 2. Vel a sacerdotibus provinciarum, &c.

² Conc. Illiber. c. iii. (Labbe. i. 971.) Flamines, qui non immolaverint, sed munus tantum dederint, eo quod se a funestis abstinerunt sacrificiis, placuit in fine eis præstari communionem, acta tamen legitima pœnitentia.

³ Ibid. c. ii. Flamines, qui post fidem lavacri sacrificaverant, placuit nec in fine eos accipere communionem.

⁴ Ibid. c. lv. p. 976. Sacerdotes, qui tantum coronam portant, nec sacrificant, nec de suis sumtibus aliquid ad idola præstant, placuit post biennium accipere communionem. — Id. c. lvi. Magistratum vero, uno anno quo agit duumviratum, prohibendum placuit, ut se ab ecclesia cohibeat.

when these offices were freed from idolatry, yet, if a magistrate still committed other crimes worthy of ecclesiastical punishment, the censures of the Church, notwithstanding his office, would lay hold of him, and the name or character of a magistrate would give him no protection. This appears plainly from the proceedings of Synesius^u against Andronicus, the governing magistrate of Ptolemais, whom he formerly excommunicated, with all his accomplices: and from what has been observed^v before, of the judge that was censured in time of Julian, mentioned by St. Ambrose;^w and Athanasius excommunicating the governor of Libya for his immoralities, mentioned by St. Basil,^x which need not here be repeated. To these I add that general rule of the first Council of Arles, made with relation to all governors of provinces,^y “That when they went to the government of any province, they should take communicatory letters from their own bishop along with them, and be subject to the care of the bishop of the places wherever they went; so as if they committed any thing contrary to the public discipline, they were to be excluded from the communion of the Church.” This was no rule to deprive magistrates of their office, though they were heretics or schismatics, as Baronius^z would have it understood: for as Albaspinæus, in his notes upon the place, more truly observes against him, there is not a word about this in the canon: neither is it likely that a provincial council should make a decree about that which is no way in their power, but in the power of the prince only. They might

^u Synes. Ep. lviii. See chap. ii. sect. viii.

^v See chap. ii. sect. xi.

^w Ambros. Epist. xxix. ad Theod. See chap. ii. sect. xi. note (*), p. 476.

^x Basil. Ep. xlvii. tot. See chap. ii. sect. xi. note (†), p. 477.

^y Conc. Arelat. I. c. vii. (Labbe. vol. i. p. 1427.) De præsidiis, qui fideles ad præsdatum prosiliunt, placuit, ut quum promoti fuerint, litteras accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias: ita tamen, ut in quibuscumque locis gesserint, ab episcopo ejusdem loci cura de illis agatur; et quum cœperint contra disciplinam agere, tum demum a communione excludantur. Similiter et de iis, qui rem publicam agere volunt.

^z Baron. an. 314, n. lvii. De præsidiis, &c.] Hactenus divina illa plane lex ecclesiastica in tam celebri episcoporum conventu, præsente, rogante (ut par est credere) atque adnuente Imperatore sancita, qua schismatici atque hæretici a præfecturis ceterisque magistratibus excludendi penitus forent.

order, and that with good reason, he says,^a "That no heretic or schismatic, although he was the governor of a province, should be admitted to communicate with the Church: but that, therefore, he should be removed from his government, because he was a heretic, was at the will and discretion of the prince, and not of the Church: it belongs to the prince, and not to the Church, to take away the power of subordinate magistrates from them." The plain drift, therefore, of this canon, is not to deprive inferior magistrates of any civil power or jurisdiction which the supreme magistrate committed to them, which the Church had no authority to do, but only to deny them her own communion, if unworthy of it; which was a thing then uncontested, and indisputably within the limits of her power.

Neither need we wonder at this, since the Church laid claim to a higher power, even of excluding princes, or the supreme magistrates, from her communion, when guilty of notorious violations of the laws of Christian society; of which there are certain evidences both in the doctrine and practice of the ancient bishops of the Church. The story which is related by Eusebius concerning the Emperor Philip, though disputed by many as to the truth of the fact, yet is a sufficient evidence of the opinion of Eusebius, who relates it. Now he tells us,^b "There was a tradition that he was a

^a Albaspin. in c. vii. Conc. Arelat. I. (Labb. tom. i. p. 1436, D.) Ne verbo quidem de schismaticis et hæreticis illo in canone agitur, aut quidquam aliud, quod probabilem hujusce sensus inducat suspicionem, reperitur. Neque vero simile est, patres, qui in illa aderant provinciali synodo, suffragiis suis aliquid sanxisse, cujus observatio in eorum non esset, sed in principis potestate. Ne quis schismaticus aut hæreticus, quamvis esset provinciæ præses, ceterorum communioni sociaretur, decernere quidem et merito poterant: sed eo quod quispiam esset hæreticus, ut a reipublicæ administratione removeretur, principis, non ecclesiæ, erat judicium: illius profecto erat imperium præsidibus abrogare, non ecclesiæ.

^b Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. c. xxxiv. (Vales. p. 189.) Τοῦτον κατ'ἔχου λόγος Χριστιανὸν ὄντα, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ὑστάτης τοῦ πάσχα παννυχίδος, τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὕτων τῶν πλῆθι μισταρχῶν ἰδελῆσαι· οὐ πρότερον δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θηνικᾶδε προεστῶτος ἱππεραπῆναι εἰσελαῖν, ἢ ἔξιμολογήσασθαι, καὶ τοῖς ἐν παραπτώμασιν ἔξιστα-ζομένοις, μισανοίαις τι χῶραι ἰσχυροῖν, ἑαυτὸν καταλίξαι· ἄλλως γὰρ μὴ ἂν ποτε πρὸς αὐτοῦ, μὴ οὐχὶ ταῦτο ποιήσαντα, διὰ πολλὰς τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν αἰτίας παραδειχθῆναι καὶ πιναρχῆσαι γε προθύμως λίγεται, τὸ γνήσιον καὶ ὑλαεῖς τῆς περὶ τὸν Διὸς φόβου διαθήκης ἔργois ἐπιδεικνύμενον.

Christian; and that on the vigil of the Passover he desired to communicate in prayers with the rest of the people; but that the bishop, who then presided, would not suffer him to enter before he had confessed his crimes, and joined himself to those who had sinned, and stood in the place or order of the penitents: for otherwise he could not be received by him, for the many crimes which he had committed. Upon which the emperor willingly obeyed, demonstrating his sincere and religious disposition towards the fear of God by the tenour of his actions." Some question the truth of the story,^c and think that it is a mistake of Philip the emperor, for one Philip, the *Præfectus Augustalis* of Egypt, who was a Christian: others defend it as a true relation,^d only they think it was a transaction in private, which is the reason we have no account of it in the heathen story. But, whether the fact was true or false, the reflection made upon it by Eusebius is of great moment in the present question: for he, supposing him to have been a Christian, says, "Without such a compliance, the bishop would never have admitted him." Which remark is sufficient to shew the nature of the Church's discipline in general, whatever becomes of the truth of this particular story.

Filesacus* and Valesius^f confound this story with the relation which St. Chrysostom gives of Babylas, denying

^c Cave's Primitive Christianity, part i. chap. iii. p. 46. See Book viii. chap. i. sect. xvii.

^d Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 244, n. iv. Quam opinionem de conversione Philippi ad fidem nostram ab Eusebio hauserunt Paulus Orosius et Vincentius Lirinensis, a Baronio, n. viii. citati, et ante illos divus Hieronymus, (lib. de Script. Eccles.) quum de Origene loquitur. Mitto alios, qui serius florere, qui alter alterum exscripsit. Doctissimus Huetius, (lib. i. Origen. c. iii. n. xii.) autumat Philippum sub ipsa imperii sui initia Christi doctrinam sequutum esse, quod in cœtum Christianorum jam creatus Imperator recipi postulaverit Antiochiæ, quo non nisi post arreptum recens imperium sese usquam contulit. Denique Baronius, cui in prima hujus voluminis editione adhæsi, arbitratur eum non nisi postquam ludos sæculares exhibuit, Christo nomen dedisse.

^e Filesac. Not. in Vincent. Lirin. c. xxiii. n. cxxv.

^f Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. xxxiv. p. 115. Historiam hanc de Philippo imperatore, quem Babylas episcopus ab ecclesiæ aditu repulit, refert auctor Chronici Alexandrini, ex narratione Leontii episcopi Antiocheni, qui sub Constantio imp. vixit. Eadem fere narrat Chrysostomus in Oratione de sancto Babyla contra Gentiles, nisi quod imperatorem ipsum non nominat.

entrance into the church to one of the Roman emperors, upon the account of a barbarous murder committed by him upon a son of some confederate prince, who was intrusted as a hostage with him. Chrysostom names neither the emperor nor the confederate prince; and the stories differ in the whole relation, but especially in this material circumstance, that Philip is said to comply with the bishop's admonition, and stand in the order of penitents; but he whom Chrysostom speaks of, was so far from submitting to the admonition of Babylas, that he remained incorrigible, and grew enraged, and cast him into prison, and loaded him with chains: which the martyr ordered to be buried with him, when the tyrant put him to death. So that this could not be Philip, but Decius, the persecuting heathen, under whom Babylas suffered. However, Chrysostom makes some curious remarks upon the behaviour of Babylas, both in reference to his courage and prudence, which abundantly shews the spirit of discipline then prevailing in the Church. For first he remarks,^s "That Babylas acted with the freedom and boldness of Elias and St. John Baptist, driving out of the church not a tetrarch of a few cities, nor a king of one nation, but him who governed the greatest part of the world; a murderer, who had many nations, many cities, and a prodigious army at his command; one that was in all respects terrible, as well upon the account of his immense dominions, as the fierceness and cruelty of his temper: him he expelled as a vile and worthless slave, with as much intrepidity, constancy, and bravery of mind, as a shepherd would drive away from his flock a scabbed and infected

^s Chrysostom. de Babyla, sive cont. Gentiles, tom. i. p. 740, C. (p. 656, edit. Francof. 1698.) Οὗτος τότε τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τὴν ἰθαδί, ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος ἰγχυρισθεῖς, τὸν Ἑλίαν, καὶ τὸν ταύτου ζηλωτὴν τὸν Ἰωάννην . . . ἴφθαι οὕτως, ὡς μὴδὶ τὸ τυχερὸν ἀπολιφθῆναι τῆς ἰλιθυρίας τῶν γυναικῶν ἐκείνων ἀνδρῶν· οὐ γὰρ τετραέρχην πόλιων ὀλίγων, οὐδὲ ἰνὸς Ἰθους βασιλεία, ἀλλὰ τὸν τοῦ παλίστου μίρους τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης κατέχοντα, αὐτὸν δὲ ταῦτα τὸν ἀνδροφόνον, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν ἴθνη, πολλὰς τε πόλεις καὶ στρατιὰν ἄσχυρον κεικτημένον, καὶ πάντοθεν ὄντα φοβερόν, ἀπὸ τι τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἀπὸ τι τῆς τῶν τρέπων θρασυήτος, ὡς ἀνδράποδον ὑπερλίτως καὶ οὐδινὸς ἄξιον, οὕτω τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξέβαλε μιστὰ τοσαύτης ἀταραξίας καὶ ἀφοβίας, μισθ' ὅσης ἂν ποιμὴν πρέσβυτος, ψώρας ἱμπερλησμένον καὶ νειοσηκὸς, τῆς ποιμένης ἀπιέρξει, καλῶν εἰς τὰ λοιπὰ διαβῆναι τὴν νόσον τοῦ κάμνοντος.

sheep, to prevent the contagion of the distemper from spreading to the rest of the flock." Here he breaks out into a rapture,^b admiring his undaunted mind, his lofty soul, his heavenly terror of spirit, and angelical constancy, superior to all this visible world, and only fixed upon God the supreme King; acting as if he stood before the great Judge, and heard him say, "Cast out the wicked and infected sheep from the holy flock." 2. Hence he observes,ⁱ "How fearless and undaunted Babylas must be with respect to other men, who gave such a specimen of his power over the emperor. He could never act or speak out of favour or hatred; but, with a mind equally fortified against fear and flattery, and all other things of the like nature, which are apt to beset men, he stood firm, and did not in the least corrupt right judgment." 3. He remarks further,^j how he tempered his courage with Christian prudence, observing a decent mien in his behaviour. A man of his undaunted spirit might have gone much further: he might have railed at the emperor,

^b Chrysostom. de Babyla, sive cont. Gentiles, tom. i. p. 740, 2, A. 6, (p. 657, edit. Francof. 1698.) "Ὁ ψυχῆς ἀκαταπλήκτου, καὶ διανοίας ὑψηλῆς· ὃ φρεσὶν εὐκρασίαν καὶ παραστήματος ἀγγελικαυῶ. . . . Ὡς ἐκείνῃ τῇ δικαστῇ παριστάς, καὶ αὐτῷ κελύοντος ἀκούων, τὸν ἱναγῇ καὶ μισρὸν τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀγίλης ἔξωθῆν, οὕτως ἐξίκαλε, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προβάτων ἀφώρεισι· καὶ πρὸς οὐδὲν ἰσχυροῦντο τῶν ἱερμίων καὶ δεκνόντων εἶναι φοβερῶν, ἀλλ' ἀνδρείως αὐτὸν μάλα καὶ γυναικίως ἀπαρσάμενος, παρίστη τυραννουμεῖσι τοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμοις.

ⁱ Ibid. C. 10. Καί τοι πόση περὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς αὐτὸν παρρησίᾳ κειρῆσθαι εἰκός· ὁ γὰρ τῇ κρατεῦντι μετὰ τοσαύτης ἔξουσίας προσιγχθῆς, τίνα τῶν λοιπῶν ἴδουσιν εἶναι; ἰγὼ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐκύνω στοχάζομαι, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ στοχάζομαι, ἀλλὰ πιστεύω, μὴ πρὸς χρέον, μὴ πρὸς ἀσίχθειαν, μῆτι περῆσαι, μηδὲ εἰπῆν εἰ πότι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς φόβον, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦτου δυνατωτέρα κελαικίαν, καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα τὰ ταναῦσα, πολλὰ δὲ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, γυναικίως στήναι καὶ ἀνδρείως, καὶ μηδὲ μικρὸν τι τῆς ἑσθῆς διαφθεῖραι κρίσεις.

^j Ibid. 743, A. 2. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ παρρησίᾳ μόνον αὐτὸν δυναμάζω χρεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μίχρῃ τοσαύτου τῇ παρρησίᾳ ἐκτυῖναι, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πάλῃ μηδὲν προσθῆναι πλῆω αὐτῇ· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σοφία, μηδὲ περιττῶς ἀγωνίζεσθαι συγχρηρῶσα, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ τὴν συμμερίαν φυλάττουσα· καὶ τοῖ γι ἰσῆν, εἴπερ ἑκούσιος καὶ πικραιτέρω προελθῆν· τῇ γὰρ ἀπαγορεύσαντι τὸ ἔξῃ, οὐδ' εἰ τὴν ἀρχὴν προσῆλθω, εἰ μὴ τοιούτοις αὐτὸν ἀπλῆσι λογισμοῖς, μιστ' ἔξουσίας ἅπαντα πρῶτον ἐξῆν, καὶ ὕβρει πλύναι τὸν βασιλεῖα, καὶ τὸ διάδημα καθελῆν τῆς κεφαλῆς, καὶ πληγὰς εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ἰντυῖναι. . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲν τούτων ἰσχυροῖσι· τῇ γὰρ ἄλατι τῇ πνευματικῇ τῇ ψυχῇ ἡσυχμίας ἦν· δι' ὅπερ οὐδὲν ἔπραττειν ἐκῆν καὶ μάστιγ, ἀλλὰ πάντα περὶ λογισμῶν ἑσθῇ, καὶ μετὰ καταστάσεως ὁγίους· οὐ καθέστηκε οἱ παρ' Ἑλλήσι σοφοί, οἱ συμμέτρως μὲν οὐδέποτε, πανταχοῦ δὲ, ὡς εἰπῆν, ἡ πλῆω ἡ ἔλαττος τοῦ δίνοντος παρρησιάζονται.

and reviled him ; he might have pulled the crown from his head, and have beaten him on the face : but his soul was seasoned with spiritual salt, which taught him to observe a decorum in all his management, and do nothing rashly or foolishly, but by the rules of right reason, which was a thing the philosophers, in their reproofs of kings, seldom observed. Hence he remarks, 4.^k Of how great advantage this example was to all men, both believers and unbelievers. The unbelievers were astonished at the action, and admired it : for they, seeing the intrepidity of the servants of Christ, could not but deride the abject servility of those who ruled in the heathen temples, when they observed them always more disposed to worship their kings than their gods or idols. Whereas Babylas punished the injurious king, as far as it was lawful for a priest¹ to do ; he pulled down the high spirit of the prince ; he vindicated the Divine laws, when they were violated ; he punished the king for his murder, with a punishment that to all men of a sound mind is the most terrible of any other. He did not, like Diogenes, bid him stand out of his sunshine ; but, when he thrust himself impudently within the sacred boundaries of the church, and confounded all good order, he drove him from his Master's house, as he would have done a dog, or an offending slave. And so the holy man took down the confidence of unbelievers, who were then the greatest part of the Roman

^k Chrysostom. de Babyla, sive cont. Gentiles, tom. i. p. 744, D. (p. 660, edit. Francof. 1698.) Οἱ δὲ αὐτοῦ κτεταίνοντες πολλοί. . . . "Ὅσοις ἂν ἦσαν ἔπιστοι, κατεπλάγησαν, καὶ ἰθαύμασαν μαθόντες, ὅσης τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις ὁ Χριστὸς τῆς παρρησίας μετῴκηκε, κατεγίλασαν τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς δουλοπρεπείας, καὶ ἀνιλευθερίας, καὶ ταπεινότητος, εἶδον ὅσον τῆς Χριστιανῶν ἐγγενείας πρὸς τὴν Ἑλλήνων αἰσχρότην τὸ μῖσος οἱ μὲν γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμίλειαν ἐγκυχευομένην, μᾶλλον διωπτόντων καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων δι' αὐτῶν τοὺς βασιλεῖς θρασυνοῦσι, καὶ διὰ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν φόβον καὶ τοῖς ξοάνοις αὐτοῖς παρεδρεύουσιν, ὡς τοὺς ποιεῖ τοὺς δαίμονας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι χάριν ἔχουν τῆς εἰς αὐτοὺς τιμῆς.

¹ Ibid. p. 747, D. 1. (p. 661, edit. cit.) Τίως δὲ τὸν ὑπερσθὴν ἐκέλευσε, καὶ ταύτην ἢ τὸν ἱερεῖα κολάζειν θύμης ἰστί, τὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων κατίστοιχαι φρονήματα, τοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμοις κινουμένοις ἰπῆμυν, τιμωρίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κακῶς σφαγίντος ἀπῆλθης, τὴν πασῶν τιμωρίων χαλιπρωτέραν τοῖς γι νῦν ἔχουσι. . . . Δίπην ἐπίβηκεν αὐτῷ τε πρίστουσαν, ἀκῆυνον πιστοτέρῃαι ἱκανῇ, εἰ μὴ λίαν ἀναισθητος ἔτυχεν ὢν, οὐχ ἥλιον διωρόμενον αὐτῷ τὸν βασιλεῖα ἱπσοτοῦντα ἀποστῆσαι ἀξίῳ, ἀλλ' ἀναιδῶς τοῖς ἱεροῖς παπιδῶντα περιβόλοις, καὶ πάντα συγχέοντα, καθάπερ τινὲ κῦμα καὶ εἰκίτην ἀγνώμονα τῶν διωποτικῶν ἀπείργων αὐλῶν.

empire. And for those who had already embraced the faith of Christ,^m he by this act made them more circumspect and religious; not only private men, but soldiers, captains, and generals; shewing them, that among Christians the prince and chief of all are but names, and that he that wears the crown, when he is to be punished and rebuked, is no more considered than one of the lowest order.ⁿ Hence he concludes, lastly, that this rare example of virtue was matter of instruction both to priests and princes: to teach princes to submit to the rules of discipline, and priests to take courage in the exercise of it: forasmuch as that the care of the world, and what is done in it, is as properly committed to them as to him that wears the purple; and that they ought rather to part with their lives, than part with or diminish that power and authority, which God from above has committed to them. Any one may perceive by this discourse of St. Chrysostom, what opinion he had of the power and extent of ecclesiastical discipline, even over sovereign princes: not to pull off their crowns and dethrone them; not to ravish away their temporal power, under the pretence of the spiritual power being superior; nor yet to speak evil of dignities, or treat them unmannerly, and revile them; but only to debar them from the communion of the Church, when by notorious wickedness they rendered themselves altogether unworthy, and really incapable of it. Which is agreeable to that general direction he gives in another place to the clergy, not to admit any one of notorious improbity, cruelty, or impurity, to the Lord's table. "Although it be

^m Chrysostom. de Bábyla, sive cont. Gentiles, tom. i. p. 749, A. (p. 664, edit. Francof. 1698.) Τὸς μὲν οὖν ἀπίστοις οὕτω συνίστασθαι ὁ μακάριος, τοὺς δὲ πιστοὺς εὐλαχιστέρας κατίσθησιν, οὐκ ἰδιώτας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ στρατιωτάς καὶ στρατηγούς, καὶ ὑπάρχους, διέξας ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ὁ πάντων ἰσχυρὸς παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς, ὀνόματα μόνον ἴσθι, καὶ τῶν ἱλαχίστων ὁ τὸ διάδημα ἔχων ἴσθαι σιμνότερος, ὅτ' ἂν πολεμῆσθαι καὶ ἱσχυμῆσθαι δέη.

ⁿ Ibid. B. 4. Ἔστι καὶ [τρίτον] κατόρθωμα οὐ τὸ εὐχόν· τὸν γὰρ μισὰ ταῦτα ἱερᾶσθαι καὶ βασιλεύειν μελλόντων τὰ φρονήματα, τῶν μὲν κατίσθαι, τῶν δὲ ἱππεῖν ἀποφύνας, ὅτι τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ πρατταμένων κυριώτερος ἰσχυρότερος ὁ τὴν ἱερᾶσθαι λαχὼν τοῦ τὴν ἀλαουργίδα ἔχοντός ἴσθαι, καὶ χρεὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ταύτης τὸ μίγνθος μὴ ἱλαττοῦν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ψυχῇ ἐξίστασθαι πρότερον, ἢ τῆς αὐθεντίας, ἣν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνῶθεν ταύτῃ συνικλήρωσι τῇ ἀρχῇ.

a commander," says he,^o "or a governor, or even he that wears the diadem, that comes unworthily, prohibit him: thou hast greater power than he." He adds, a little after,^p "If thou art afraid to do this, bring him unto me. I will not suffer any such thing to be done: I will sooner give my own life, than the body of the Lord unworthily: I will shed my own blood, before I will give that most holy blood to an unworthy man."

But there is none more famous than St. Ambrose, for his remarkable freedom in this matter with the greatest of princes, whether in admonishing them, or in denying them the communion, upon the commission of some great offences. Paulinus, the writer of his Life, says,^q "He separated Maximus from the communion, admonishing him to repent for shedding the blood of Gratian his lord, if ever he hoped to find mercy at the hands of God." So when Valentinian was solicited by Symmachus, the heathen governor of Rome, to restore the Gentile rites, and suffer the altar of Victory to be repaired in the Capitol; St. Ambrose wrote to him, and told him, among many other arguments,^r "That if he thus gratified the heathen in restoring idolatry, the bishops could not bear or dissemble it with a patient mind. He might, if he pleased, come to church; but he would either find no priest there, or else only one to resist him, and deny him communion. And what will you answer," says he, "to the priest, when he tells you, 'The Church desires not your oblations or gifts, because you have adorned the temples

^o Chrysostom. Hom. lxxxii. sive lxxxiii. in Matth. p. 705, C. (p. 869, edit. Francof.) *Κἄν στρατηγός τις ᾖ, καὶ ὑπαρχος, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τὸ διάδημα περιεπίμυνος, ἀναξίως δὲ προσίη, κώλυσον, μίζονα ἐκίνου τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχης.*

^p Ibid. 706, line 7. *Εἰ δὲ αὐτὸς οὐ τολμᾷ, ἡμεῖς πρόσβαν, οὐ συγχωρήσω ταῦτα τολμᾶσθαι· σὴς ψυχῆς ἀποστήσομαι πρότερον, ἢ τοῦ σώματος μεταδώσω τοῦ διαποτιστοῦ παραξίαν· καὶ τὸ αἶμα τὸ ἡμῶν προήσομαι πρότερον, ἢ μεταδώσω αἵματος οὕτω φρικώδους παρὰ τὸ προσῆκον.*

^q Paulin. Vit. Ambros. Ipsum Maximum a communionis consortio segregavit, admonens, ut effusi sanguinis Domini sui ageret poenitentiam, si sibi apud Deum velit esse consultum.

^r Ambros. Epist. xxx. ad Valentin. Junior. (ep. xi. tom. v. p. 194, edit. Paris. 1642.) Quid respondebis sacerdoti dicenti tibi, 'Munera tua non querit ecclesia, quia templa Gentilium muneribus adornasti? Ara Christi dona tua respuit, quoniam aram simulacris fecisti.'

of the Gentiles with your gifts? The altar of Christ refuses your gifts, because you have erected an altar to the idol gods.’”

But the most remarkable instance of his freedom was shewed in his treatment of Theodosius the Great, after he had inhumanly put to death seven thousand men at Thessalonica, without distinguishing the innocent from the guilty. When he had committed this fact, not being very sensible of his crime, he came to Milan, and, according to custom, was going to church; but St. Ambrose met him at the gate, and accosted him in this manner, as Theodoret relates the story: “ ‘ You seem not to understand, sir, the greatness of the murder you have committed. Your anger not being yet allayed, hinders your reason from considering what you have done. And perhaps the greatness of your empire will not suffer you to acknowledge your offence, and power opposes itself to reason. But you must know that our nature is mortal and frail: our original is dust, whence we were taken, and into which we must return again. It is not fit you should deceive yourself with the splendour of your purple, and forget the weakness of the body that is covered with it. Your subjects, sir, are of the same nature with yourself, and you are a servant as well as they: for we have one common Lord and King, the maker of this universe. Therefore with what eyes will you look upon the house of our common Lord? With what feet will you tread his holy pavement? Will you stretch forth those hands still drop-

* Theodoret. lib. v. c. xviii. (Vales. p. 220.) Οὐκ οἶσθα ὡς ἴσκειν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, τῆς ἐργασμένης μαιφονίας τὸ μίγνθος, οὐδὲ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ παύλαν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐπίγνῳ τὸ τελευτήν; εὐκ ἐφ’ ἡγὰρ ἴσως τῆς βασιλείας ἡ δυναστεία ἐπιγινώσκει τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἀλλ’ ἐπιπρὸς τοῦ ἡξουσία τῷ λογισμῷ χρεὶ μὴ τοι εἰδῆναι τὴν φύσιν, καὶ τὸ ταύτης θνητὸν τι καὶ διαρρῆιον, καὶ τὸν πρόγονον χυτῶν, ἐξ οὗ γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ εἰς ὃν ἀπορρῆομαι καὶ μὴ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τῆς ἀλουεργίδος ἀποδοικολοῦμενον ἀργεῖν τοῦ παλινπομπίνου σώματος τὴν ἀσθένειαν ὁμοφυῶν ἀρχεῖς, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καὶ μὴ δὴ καὶ ὁμοδούλων. εἰς γὰρ ἀπάντων δισπότης καὶ βασιλεὺς, ὁ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργός. ποίους τοίνυν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἄψιν τὸν τοῦ κοινοῦ δισπότου νῶν; ποίους δὲ περὶ τὸ δάπιδον ἐκείνου πατήσῃς τὸ ἅγιον; πῶς δὲ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτενῆς, ἀποσταζούσας ἔτι τοῦ αἵματος φόνου τὸ αἷμα; πῶς δὲ τοιαύταις ὑποδίζῃ χειρὶ τοῦ δισπότου τὸ πανάγιον σῶμα; πῶς δὲ τῷ στόματι προσοίσεις τὸ αἷμα τὸ τίμιον, τοσοῦτον διὰ τὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ λόγον ἐκχίας παρενόμενος αἷμα; ἄπειθι τοίνυν, καὶ μὴ πιεῖς τοῖς διωτῆρος τὴν προτίραν αἰσχρὴν παρενομίαν, καὶ δέχου τὸν δισπῶν, ᾧ ὁ Θεός, ὁ τῶν ὅλων δισπότης, ἀντιθεῖ γίνεσθαι σύμψηφος· ἱατρικὸς δὲ οὗτος, καὶ πρόξενος ὑγιείας, π. τ. λ.

ping with the blood of that unjust murder, and therewith take the holy body of the Lord? And then put the cup of that precious blood to your mouth, who have shed so much blood by the hasty decree of an angry mind? Depart, I beseech you, and do not aggravate and augment your former iniquity by the addition of a new crime. Refuse not those bonds which the Lord of all confirms from heaven above. It is but a small thing that is laid upon you, but it will recover you to perfect health and salvation.' The emperor, who had been educated in the holy doctrine, and knew what were the different offices of priests and kings, was so moved with these words, that he returned to his palace with groans and tears. Eight months passed between this and the festival of our Saviour's Nativity; and all that time the emperor sat lamenting in his own palace, and shedding rivers of tears. Which Ruffin, the master of the palace, who, for his familiarity with the emperor, could take a great freedom with him, observing, he came to him, and desired to know the reason of his tears. To whom the emperor replied, 'You make a jest of the thing, Ruffin: for you are not touched with the sense of my misfortunes: but I mourn and lament in consideration of my calamity, that whilst the temple of God is open to the very slaves and beggars, and they can go in freely, and supplicate their Lord, it is inaccessible to me; and, besides all this, heaven is shut against me: for I remember the words of our Lord, which plainly say, 'Whomsoever ye shall bind on earth, he shall be bound in heaven.' Then Ruffin said, 'I will go, therefore, to the bishop, if you please, and entreat him to loose your bonds.' The emperor replied, 'He will not be persuaded. For I know the justice of the sentence which St. Ambrose has given; and he will not, out of any reverence to the imperial power, transgress the Divine law.' But Ruffin insisting, and with many words, promising to appease Ambrose towards him; he bid him go quickly, and he himself followed a little after, relying upon the promises of Ruffin. But St. Ambrose no sooner saw Ruffin, but he said to him, 'Ruffin, thou art a very shameless man. For thou wast the evil counsellor of so great a slaughter; and now thou hardenest thy forehead,

and hast cast away shame, neither blushing nor trembling for so great a ravagement made of the image of God.' Ruffin still went on with his supplication, and told him the emperor himself was a-coming. At which St. Ambrose, kindled with a Divine fervour, said, 'I tell thee beforehand, Ruffin, I will not admit him within the Divine gates: but and if he will turn his empire into tyranny, and slay me also, I shall, with great pleasure, take my death.' Ruffin hearing this, sent one immediately to the emperor, to certify him of the bishop's resolution, and to desire him to stay in the palace: but the emperor, being on his way in the middle of the forum, when he received the message, said, 'I will go and bear his just reproofs.' When he came to the holy boundaries, he would not enter into the church; but, going to the bishop, as he sat in the saluting-house, he begged of him to absolve him from his bonds. But Ambrose told him, 'This his coming was tyrannical; and that he now began to rage against God, and trample upon the Divine laws.' The emperor said, 'By no means; I do not offer myself against the prescription of the laws; I do not desire to enter the church in an unlawful manner; but I entreat you to absolve me from my bonds, and to remember the clemency of our common Lord, and not shut the gate against me, which the Lord hath opened to all those that turn to him with repentance.' 'What repentance, then,' said the bishop, 'have you shewed since the commission of so great a wickedness? With what medicine have you cured your grievous wounds?' The emperor replied, 'It belongs to your office to prepare the medicine, and cure those wounds; and my part is to use what you prescribe.' 'Then,' said St. Ambrose, 'forasmuch as you have suffered anger and fury, and not reason, to sit in judgment and give sentence in matters before; now make a law, which may render all judgment given in anger null and void: when any sentence of death or confiscation is pronounced, let there be thirty days' time between that and the execution, to wait for the judgment of reason. When this term is expired, let the scribes again present the sentence you have given, before you; and then reason, without anger, will be able to examine the sentence by her own judgment,

and discern whether it be just or unjust. If it be unjust, cancel and reverse it; if just, corroborate and confirm it; and this number of days will be no prejudice to any righteous sentence.' The emperor approved of the proposal, and immediately ordered such a law to be written, and confirmed it with his own hand. Then St. Ambrose absolved him from his bonds, and the emperor took courage to enter into the church; but he would neither stand nor kneel, while he made supplication to the Lord, but fell upon his face to the earth, using those words of David, 'My soul cleaveth to the ground, quicken thou me, according to thy word;' and, tearing his hair, and beating his forehead, and watering the pavement with drops of tears; with these indications of sorrow, he prayed for pardon. And so when the time of the oblation came, he was admitted again to make his offering at the holy table."

I have related this matter at full length, in Theodoret's words, because, as he there observes, "It is such an illustrious instance of the virtue, both of the bishop and the emperor, shewing the freedom and flaming fervour of the one, and a great condescension, obedience, and purity of faith in the other." Theodoret adds, "That when the emperor was returned to Constantinople, he was pleased to say, 'He had now learned the difference between an emperor and a bishop; he had now at last found a guide to shew him what was truth: for Ambrose alone was worthy the name of a bishop.' So useful an impression," says our author, "does a reproof or admonition make, when given by a man of shining virtue."

After this, it is needless to relate any later instances of this kind of discipline exercised upon princes: but it may be proper to remind the reader here again of that necessary distinction between the greater and lesser excommunication: the former of which separates a criminal from all manner of society with the faithful; the other, only from communion and society in holy things in the Church; and to observe, with many learned men, that these excommunications of princes now mentioned, never went further than to a prudent admonition, and suspension of them from the sacrament and

the holy offices of the Church. "St. Ambrose," says Bishop Buckeridge,[†] in answer to Bellarmine, "did plainly prohibit Theodosius from entering the church, and partaking of the sacraments; but he neither delivered him to Satan, nor reduced him into the number of publicans or pagans, nor separated him from all society and communion with the faithful. If Bellarmine spake properly of the greater excommunication, the proof of a doubtful matter lies upon him; if only of the lesser excommunication, or suspension, which forbids men entrance into the church, and communion in the sacraments, we do not deny but that Theodosius was so excommunicated by St. Ambrose." For St. Ambrose told him, 'He durst not offer the sacrifice, if he was present. He thought he saw him in a vision come to the church, and then he durst not celebrate because of his presence. He could not accept his oblation, till he had power to offer, and till his offering would be acceptable to God.' He suspended him, therefore, from the sacrament, but did not lay upon him the anathema, or greater excommunication." Bishop Taylor takes excommunication in this sense, when he says,[‡]

[†] Joan. Roffens. de Potestate Papæ Temporalis, lib. ii. c. xxxix. p. 927. In his aperte prohibet Ambrosius Theodosium ab ingressu ecclesiæ et communione sacramentorum; sed nec Satanæ tradit, nec in numerum publicanorum et ethnicorum redigit, nec cætu et communione fidelium separat. Si ergo de excommunicatione majore proprie loquatur Bellarminus, incumbit ei probatio; sic enim excommunicatum fuisse, dubitari potest. Si de excommunicatione minori, sive suspensione, quæ tantum limina ecclesiæ et sacramentorum communionem negat, loquatur, non negamus sic ab Ambrosio excommunicatum Theodosium. Vincula vero hæc, quibus ligatus est Theodosius, fuerunt vincula peccatorum, quæ ab Ambrosio retenta sunt. 'Quidquid ligaveris in terra, ligatum erit in cælis;' quæ verba et ad peccatorum retentionem et ad anathematis sive excommunicationis sententiam pertingunt. Excommunicatio ergo ista est minor, non major; id quod verba Ambrosii satis docent, 'Causam contumaciæ in te nullam habeo, sed habeo timoris: offerre non audeo sacrificia, si volueris adistere.' An excommunicatio ulla sine contumaciâ? Immo et se prohibitum docet visione, ne offerret. 'Quum enim essem sollicitus ipsa nocte, qua proficisci putabam, venisse quidem visus es ad ecclesiam, sed mihi sacrificium offerre non licuit.' Et infra, 'Tunc offeres, quum sacrificandi acceperis facultatem, quando hostia tua accepta sit Deo.' Non ergo separatus est a consortio fidelium, nec Satanæ traditus, sed ligatus in peccato, donec condignam egerat penitentiam, et exclusus a liminibus et sacramentis ecclesiæ. — See Dr. Barrow, on the Pope's Supremacy, p. 12.

[‡] Ambros. Epist. xxviii. ad Theodosium.

[†] Taylor, Duct. Dubitant. book iii. chap. iv. p. 604.

“ If we consult the doctrine and practices of the Fathers in the primitive and ancient Churches, we shall find that they never durst think of excommunicating kings. The first supreme prince that was ever excommunicated by a bishop, was Henry the emperor by Pope Hildebrand.” He adds, “ That there is one portion of excommunication, which is a denying to administer the holy communion to princes of a scandalous and evil life; and, concerning this, there is no question but the bishop not only may, but, in some cases, must do it. Christ says, ‘ Give not that which is holy, unto dogs; and cast not pearls before swine.’ Whatsoever is in the ecclesiastical hand by Divine right, is as applicable to him that sits upon the throne, as to him that sits upon the dunghill.” But then he says one thing, which, as I conceive, contradicts this, viz.,^w “ That this refusing must be only by admonition and caution, by fears and denunciations evangelical; by telling him his unfitness to communicate, and his danger if he do. But if after this separation by way of sentence and proper ministry, the prince will be communicated, the bishop has nothing else to do, but to pray, and weep, and willingly to minister.” This not only contradicts what he just says before, “ That a bishop is obliged in duty to deny to administer the communion to princes of a scandalous and evil life,” but is directly contrary to the doctrine and practice of St. Chrysostom and St. Ambrose, who profess they would rather die than give the communion to a prince that was utterly incapable and unworthy of it.

SECT. VI.— *In what Cases the greater Excommunication was forborne for the Good of the Church.*

Yet as to what concerns the greater excommunication, it is certain that in some cases it was forborne, not only with relation to princes, but the people also. For prudence directed them to do every thing for the good of the Church; and to use this severe weapon only to edification, and not to destruction. And therefore when it was apparent, or but highly probable, that the intemperate and indiscreet use of

^w Taylor, Duct. Dubitant. book iii. chap. iv. p. 605. See also his Worthy Communicant, chap. v. sect. vi. p. 487.

it might do more harm than good to the Church, there both reason and charity directed them to waive the use of it, for fear of rooting up the wheat with the tares, before the proper time of judgment. As to princes, Dr. Barrow, in a few words, which contain a great deal of ancient history, has further observed,* “That though there were many sovereign princes in the Primitive Church, who were heretics and enemies to true religion, yet no ancient pope seems to have been of opinion that they might excommunicate them. For if they might, why did not Pope Julius or Pope Liberius excommunicate Constantius, the great favourer of the Arians? How did Julian himself escape the censure of Liberius? Why did not Damasus thunder against Valens, that fierce persecutor of the Catholics? Why did not Damasus censure the Empress Justina, the patroness of Arianism? Why did not Siricius censure Theodosius for that bloody fact, for which St. Ambrose denied him the communion? How was it that Pope Leo (that stout and high pope) had not the heart to correct Theodosius Junior in his way, who was the supporter of his adversary Dioscorus, and the obstinate protector of the second Ephesine Council, which that pope so much detested? Why did not that pope rather compel that emperor by censures, than supplicate him by tears? How did so many popes connive at Theodoric and other princes professing Arianism at their door? Why did not Simplicius or Felix thus punish the Emperor Zeno, the supplanter of the Council of Chalcedon, for which they had so much zeal? Why did neither Felix, nor Gelasius, nor Symmachus, nor Hormisdas, excommunicate the Emperor Anastasius (‘Yea, did not so much,’ Pope Gelasius says, ‘as touch his name’), for countenancing the Oriental bishops in their schism, and refractory non-compliance with the papal authority? Those popes did indeed clash with their emperor, but they expressly deny that they did condemn him with others whom he did favour. ‘We,’ says Pope Symmachus,† ‘did not excommunicate you, O emperor, but

* Barrow of the Pope’s Supremacy, p. 12.

† Symmach. Ep. vi. (apud Labb. tom iv. Conc. p. 1298, fin.) Nos non te excommunicavimus, imperator, sed Acacium. Tu recede ab Acacio, et ab illius

Acacius. If you mingle yourself, you are not excommunicated by us, but by yourself.' 'And,' says Gelasius,^z 'if the emperor is pleased to join himself with those that are condemned, that cannot be imputed to us.' Wherefore Baronius^a doth ill in affirming Pope Symmachus to have anathematized Anastasius; whereas that pope plainly denied it even in those words which are cited to prove it, being rightly read: for they are corruptly written^b in Baronius and Binius: *Ego* (which hath no sense, or one contradictory to his former assertion), being put for *nego*, which is good sense, and agreeable to what he and the other popes do affirm in relation to that matter:" that they did not pretend to anathematize the emperor with other heretics whom they so condemned.

Indeed there were three reasons why the ancients forbore to anathematize sovereign princes. One was that which has just now been mentioned, because they thought they had no power to excommunicate them in such manner, but only to deny them the participation of the eucharist. Another reason was, that heretical princes did in effect excommunicate themselves by deserting the Church, and joining with heretics; and therefore the Church had no reason to pronounce anathema against them. A third reason was, that the doing so might have done more harm than good to the Church, by irritating and exasperating the minds of heretical princes to persecute the Church with greater malice, and thereby many weak members of the Church might have been scandalized and offended. Therefore Bishop Buckridge

excommunicatione recedis. Tu te noli miscere excommunicationi ejus, et non es excommunicatus a nobis. Si te misces, non a nobis sed a te ipso excommunicatus es.

^z Gelas. Ep. iv. (apud Labb. tom. iv. Conc. p. 1168.) Si isti placet miscere damnatis, nobis non potest imputari.

^a Baron. an. 503, n. xvii. Qui ab ipso Symmacho anathemate idem damnatus est Anastasius imperator, &c.

^b Symmach. Ep. vii. Dicis quod, mecum conspirante senatu, excommunicaverim te. Ista quidem ego, sed rationabiliter factum a decessoribus meis sine dubio subsequor. So Baronius and Binius read it, 'Ista quidem ego;' but the true reading is, 'Ista quidem nego,' 'I deny that I excommunicated you.' And yet Labbé retains that corrupt reading without any remark upon it: Conc. tom. iv. p. 1298.

says,^c “ In such cases, where princes are fierce and cruel, and impatient of reproof and indignity, it were, perhaps, better to abstain from the severity of the lesser excommunication as well as the greater, rather than for a bishop to provoke an armed fury to turn itself both upon him and the Church: it were better to keep the sword in the sheath, than to unsheath it to the detriment and destruction of the Church and religion. Therefore, admitting that of right kings and emperors might be excommunicated, yet the expediency of the thing is a very different question, and remains yet not perfectly resolved, whether it be for the advantage of the Church to use such severity against her patrons, her defenders, and her advocates ; that is, emperors and kings.

And this consideration of expediency made St. Austin and others determine, not only in the case of kings, but the people also, that when the whole multitude were involved in the same crime, either by actual commission, or abetting, or applauding the practice of it, that then the severity of excommunication, especially in the highest degree, could not be used toward them with any sort of prudence, for fear it should have either no effect, or a very bad one. When a single criminal is separated by discipline from the society of the Church, the being avoided by the rest is a proper way to bring him to shame: but when the whole society, or a considerable part of it, is involved in a common crime, there is no possibility of putting such a multitude of criminals out of countenance, because they will encourage and bear up one another: and therefore, in that case, to exercise severity of discipline upon them, is only to make it despised by them, and throw the Church into schisms and convulsions, by the opposition of the turbulent and factious, and to scandalize the weak and injudicious, who will be led away by the powerful side, and perish, by rooting out the tares before the time. St. Austin argues this matter frequently with the Donatists, who were for having a Church without spot and wrinkle upon earth, and for rooting out the tares wherever they found them, whatever consequences might attend it.

^c Joan. Roffens. de Potestate Papæ in Temporalibus, lib. ii. c. xxxix. p. 931.

"Though," he observes, "they did not keep to their own rule: for they tolerated one Optatus Gildonianus, a most infamous man, noted for his villanies over all Afric, and did not excommunicate him, for fear he should have carried off a multitude with him, and have broken their communion by new schisms and subdivisions among themselves." St. Austin^d does not blame them for this, but only objects to them as an argument *ad hominem*, to shew them that they ought not to blame the Church for doing that in necessity, which they themselves were forced to do upon the like occasion. As to the practice of the Church, he freely owns she was forced many times to tolerate the tares among the wheat, when they were grown numerous, and it was dangerous to eradicate them by the rough means of severe discipline, for fear of overturning the Church, and destroying its unity and peace by dangerous schisms, and scandalizing more weak souls that way than they could hope to gain by the other. It was so in Cyprian's time, he says, and it was so in his own. He often repeats and urges upon this occasion that famous passage of Cyprian, in his book *De Lapsis*, where, speaking of the reasons of God's visiting the Church with that terrible persecution, he plainly intimates, that such numbers both of the clergy and laity had corrupted their morals, that good men could do nothing but mourn, and keep themselves as well as they could from partaking in their sins: but that could not then be done by the exercise of discipline, by reason of the numbers of all orders that

^d Aug. Epist. clxiv. ad Emeritum Donatistam, (Bened. vol. ii. p. 159, A. B.) Non ergo reprehendimus, si eo tempore, ne multos secum excommunicatus traheret, et communionem vestram schismatis furore præcideret, eum excommunicare noluistis. Sed hoc ipsum est, quod vos arguit in iudicio Dei, frater Emerite, quod quum videritis tam magnum malum esse, dividi partem Donati, ut Optatus potius in communione tolerandus existimaretur, quam illud admitteretur; permagnetis in eo malo, quod in dividenda ecclesia Christi a vestris majoribus perpetratum est. — Id. Epist. clxx. ad Severin. (p. 90, D.) Vos nostis, maxime quia tam multi scelerati apud eos emeruerunt, et toleraverunt illos per tot annos, ne partem Donati conscinderent, &c. — Id. Epist. clxxi. ad Donatistas, (136, E.) Si malorum permixtionem timeretis, Optatum inter vos in apertissima iniquitate viventem per tot annos non teneretis. — Cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. ii. c. ii. Optatum Gildonianum, decennalem totius Africæ gemitum, tamquam sacerdotem atque collegam honorantes in communione tenuerunt, &c. (Vol. ix. p. 18, g.)

were to be subjects of it, many of those who were to exercise it, being themselves the most obnoxious; and it was not to be expected, that they should be very forward to put it in execution. So that the disease being grown too obstinate and strong to be cured this way, there remained no other remedy but the severity of a Divine judgment, to rectify by an extraordinary scourge what human power could not do in the ordinary way at such a juncture. "The Lord," says Cyprian,* "was therefore minded himself to prove his family: and because a long peace had corrupted the discipline that was given us from heaven, the Divine judgment stepped in to raise that faith which was fallen, and almost laid asleep. All men's minds were set upon augmenting their estates; and forgetting what the first Christians did in the times of the apostles, and what they ought always to do, they, by an insatiable ardour of covetousness, only studied to increase

* Cyprian. de Lapsis, (pp. 88, 89, edit. Fell. Amstelod. 1700.) Dominus probari familiam suam voluit, et quia traditam nobis divinitus disciplinam pax longa corruperat, jacentem fidem, et pene dixerim dormientem, censura cælestis erexit; quumque nos peccatis nostris amplius pati mereremur, clementissimus Dominus sic cuncta moderatus est, ut hoc omne, quod gestum est, exploratio potius quam persecutio videretur. Studebant augendo patrimonio singuli; et oblitii quid credentes, aut sub apostolis ante fecissent, aut semper facere deberent, insatiabili cupiditatis ardore ampliandis facultatibus incubabant. Non in sacerdotibus religio devota, non in ministris vita integra, non in operibus misericordia, non in moribus disciplina. Corrupta barba in viris, in feminis forma fucata. Adulterati post Dei manus oculi, capilli mendacio colorati. Ad decipienda corda simplicium callidæ fraudes, circumveniendis fratribus subdolæ voluntates: jungere cum infidelibus vinculum matrimonii, prostituere Gentilibus membra Christi: non jurare tantum temere, sed adhuc etiam pejerare: præpositos superbo timore contemnere, venenato sibi ore maledicere, odiis pertinacibus invicem dissidere: episcopi plurimi, quos et hortamento esse oportet ceteris et exemplo, Divina procuratione contenta, procuratores rerum sæcularium fieri, derelicta cathedra, plebe deserta, per alienas provincias oberrantes, negotiationis quæstuosæ nundinas aucupari. Esurientibus in ecclesia fratribus non subvenire, habere argentum largiter velle, fundos insidiosis fraudibus rapere, usuris multiplicantibus fœnus augere. Quid non perpeti tales pro peccatis ejusmodi mereremur? quum jam pridem præmonuerit ac dixerit censura Divina, 'Si dereliquerint legem meam, et in judiciis meis non ambulaverint; si justificationes meas profanaverint, et præcepta mea non observarint; visitabo in virga facinora eorum, et in flagellis delicta eorum.' Prænuntiata sunt ista nobis, et ante prædicta: sed nos date legis et observationis immemores, id egimus per nostra peccata, ut, dum Domini mandata contempsimus, ad correctionem delicti et probationem fidei remediis severioribus veniremus. (Oxon. 1682, p. 123.)

their fortunes. There was no true religion or devotion in the priests, no sincere faith in the ministers, no mercy in their works, no discipline in their morals. Effeminacy and fraud were reigning vices both in men and women. They made no scruple to marry with infidels, and prostitute the members of Christ to the heathen. They were equally given both to profane swearing and perjury, to condemn their governors with swelling pride, to curse themselves with venomous tongues, and with inveterate hatred and animosities to quarrel with one another. Many bishops, who ought to have been both monitors and examples to the rest, forsook their Divine calling, to take upon them the management of secular affairs; and, leaving their sees, and deserting their people, they rambled about other provinces, seeking for such business as would bring them in gain and advantage. In the meantime they suffered the poor of the Church to starve, whilst they themselves minded nothing but heaping up riches, and getting of estates by fraud and violence, by usury and extortion. What did we not deserve to suffer for such sins as these? Our crimes required, that, for the correction of our manners, and the trial of our faith, God should bring us to severer remedies."

Cyprian here plainly intimates, that, in such a corrupt state of affairs, the discipline of the Church could not be maintained, or be rightly put in execution. He was forced to endure these colleagues of his, who were covetous, rapacious, extortioners, usurers, deserters, fraudulent, and cruel. It was impossible to exercise Church-censures with any good effect, when there were such multitudes both of priests and people ready to oppose them, and distract the Church into a thousand schisms, rather than suffer themselves to be curbed or reformed that way: and, therefore, when no other practicable method was left, the Divine censure was necessary, as the last and only remedy.

And this is what St. Austin so often tells the Donatists, that the Church followed the example of Cyprian in this matter.^f "When we are not permitted to excommunicate

^f Aug. lib. ad Donatistas post Collat. c. xx. (tom. vii. opp. p. 608, edit. Basil. 1569, (Bened. 1700, vol. ix. p. 406, B.) Ubi hoc facere (nimirum malos a

offenders, for the sake of the peace and tranquillity of the Church, we do not, therefore, neglect the Church, but only tolerate what we would not, to obtain what we would have, using the caution of our Lord's command, least, whilst we gather out the tares before the time, we should with them root up the wheat also. Following also the example and precept of St. Cyprian, who endured, with a view and regard to peace, many of his colleagues, who were usurers, defrauders, rapacious, and yet he was not infected with their contagion." So he says again,^g "The evil are sometimes to be endured for the sake of the good; as the prophets tolerated those against whom they spake so many hard things, and did not forsake the communion of the sacraments used by that people because of them; as our Lord himself tolerated wicked Judas to the last, and permitted him to communicate in the same holy supper with his innocent disciples; as the apostles tolerated those who preached Christ out of envy, which is the devil's sin; and as Cyprian tolerated the covetousness of his fellow-bishops, which he himself, according to the apostle, styles idolatry." St. Austin frequently urges this example of Cyprian in other places: and he argues further, for the necessity of the practice, from the reason and nature of the thing itself, and from the precepts of the Gospel. In his book against Parmenian,^h he

populo Dei separare) pacis et tranquillitatis ecclesiæ gratia non permittimur, non tamen ideo ecclesiam negligimus; sed toleramus quæ nolumus, ut perveniamus quo volumus, utentes cautela præcepti Dominici, ne, quum volumus ante tempus colligere zizania, simul eradicemus et triticum. Utentes etiam exemplo et præcepto beati Cypriani, qui collegas suos feneratoros, fraudatores, raptos, pacis contemplatione pertulit tales, nec eorum contagione factus est talis.

^g Aug. Epist. xlviii. ad Vincent. p. 66, (tom. iii. p. 174, edit. Basil.) (Bened. vol. ii. p. 179, E.) Non propter malos boni deserendi, sed propter bonos mali tolerandi sunt: sicut toleraverunt prophetae, contra quos tanta dicebant, nec communionem sacramentorum illius populi relinquebant; sicut ipse Dominus nocentem Judam usque ad condignum ejus exitum toleravit, et eum sacram cenam cum innocentibus communicare permisit; sicut tolerarunt apostoli eos, qui per invidiam (quod ipsius diaboli vitium est) Christum adnuntiabant; sicut toleravit Cyprianus collegarum avaritiam, quam, secundum apostolum, appellat idololatriam.

^h Ibid. de Bapt. lib. ix. c. iv. (tom. vii. p. 422), (Bened. vol. ix. p. 86, F.) Neque enim adversus coëpiscopos suos falsum testimonium diceret. Et tamen eos propter Christum, qui pro infirmis mortuus est, ne ante tempus eradicatis zizaniis simul eradicaretur et triticum, paternæ et maternæ caritatis visceribus toleravit, &c.—

shews at large, when excommunication or anathematizing is to be used, and when not. It may be used, when there is no danger of rooting up the wheat together with the tares; that is,ⁱ “When a man’s crime is so notorious to all, and appears so execrable to all, that he has no defenders, or not so many or so powerful as to make a schism; then the severity of discipline ought not to sleep: for then it will be effectual to correct his wickedness, when all charitably and unanimously join to confirm the sentence. And then it is, that there is no danger hereby of prejudicing peace and unity, or of doing harm to the wheat, when the whole multitude, or congregation of the Church, is free from the crime that is anathematized: for then they will be ready to assist the bishop in his correction, and not the criminal in his resistance. Then they will abstain from his society for his good; and no one will so much as eat with him, not out of enmity, but for brotherly coercion. Then he also will be smitten with fear, and cured by shame, when he sees himself anathematized by the whole Church, and can find no company to encourage him to rejoice in his crime, or help him to insult the virtuous.” And, therefore, he says, the apostle requires, that such a one’s punishment, or censure, should be inflicted of many: for a censure is of no advantage, except when such a one is corrected, as has not a multitude on his side to uphold him. “But when the same disease has seized a multitude, good men, in that case, can do nothing further but grieve and mourn; and, therefore, the same apostle, when he found a multitude among the Corinthians, who were defiled with uncleanness, and lasciv-

Id. cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. iii. c. ii. ibid. p. 57, (Bened. vol. ix. p. 40, C.) Dicant ergo, si possunt, meliorem se atque purgatorem habere nunc ecclesiam, quam erat ipsa unitas beatissimi Cypriani temporibus, qui collegas suos, a quibus tamen nulla corporali disjunctione separatus est, nullum eorum nominatim appellans, sed prudenter ac sobrie saluberrimæ mordacitatis inferens medicinam, his verbis graviter arguit, &c.

ⁱ *Aug. cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. iii. c. ii. p. 60, (Bened. vol. ix. p. 42, D.)* Ipse Dominus, quum servis, volentibus zizania colligere, dixit, ‘Sinite utraque crescere usque ad messem;’ præmisit causam, dicens, ‘Ne forte, quum vultis colligere zizania, eradicetis simul et triticum.’ Ubi satis ostendit, quum metus iste non subest, sed omnino de frumentorum certa stabilitate certa securitas manet: id est, quando ita cujusque crimen notum est, et omnibus execrabile apparet, ut

viousness, and fornication, writing to them in his second Epistle, he does not command them, with such not to eat, as he had done before: for they were many, and he could not now say, 'If any brother be a notorious fornicator, or an idolater, or covetous, or the like, with such a one, no, not to eat:' but he says, 'Lest when I come again, my God will humble me among you; and I shall bewail many who have sinned, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and lasciviousness, and fornication, which they have committed:' threatening them, by his bewailing, that they should be punished by the Divine scourge, rather than that punishment which consisted in men's withdrawing from their society. His mourning would obtain of the Lord a scourge to correct them, who could not now, by reason of their multitude, be corrected in such manner, as that others should abstain from their society, and make them ashamed; as it may be done in the case of a single brother, who is noted for a crime, from which all the rest are free. And, indeed,

vel nullos prorsus, vel non tales habeat defensores, per quos possit schisma contingere: non dormiat severitas disciplinæ, in qua tanto est efficacior emendatio pravitatis, quanto diligentior conservatio caritatis. Tunc autem hoc sine labe pacis et unitatis, et sine læsione frumentorum fieri potest, quum congregationis ecclesiæ multitudo ab eo crimine, quod anathematur, aliena est. Tunc autem adjuvat præpositum potius corripientem, quam criminisum resistentem: tunc se ab ejus conjunctione salubriter continet, ut nec cibum quisquam cum eo sumat: non rabie inimica, sed coërcitione fraterna. Tunc etiam ille et timore percutitur, et pudore sanatur, quum ab universa ecclesia se anathematum videns, sociam turbam, cum qua in delicto suo gaudeat, et bonis insultet, non potest invenire. Ad hoc enim et ipse apostolus ait, 'Si quis frater nominatur.' In eo, quippe, quod ait, 'Si quis,' nihil aliud videtur significare voluisse, nisi eum posse tali modo salubriter corrigi, qui inter dissimiles peccat, id est, inter eos, quos peccatorum similium pestilentia non corrumpit. In eo vero, quod ait, 'nominatur,' hoc nimirum intelligi voluit, parum esse, ut si quisque talis, nisi etiam nominetur, id est, famosus appareat, ut possit omnibus dignissima videri, quæ in eum fuerit anathematis prolata sententia. Ita enim et salva pace corrigitur, et . . . medicinaliter uritur. Propterea de illo dixit, quem tali medicina sanari voluerat, 'Satis huic est correctio quæ fit a multis.' Neque enim potest esse salubris a multis correctio, nisi quum ille corripitur, qui non habet sociam multitudinem. Quum vero idem morbus plurimos occupaverit, nihil aliud bonis restat, quam dolor et gemitus; ut per illud signum, quod Ezechieli sancto revelatur, illæsi evadere ab illorum vastatione mereantur. . . . Ideoque idem apostolus, quum jam multos comperisset immunda luxuria et fornicationibus inquinatos, ad eosdem Corinthios, in secunda Epistola scribens, non itidem præcipit, ut cum talibus nec cibum sumerent. Multi enim erant, nec dici de his poterat, 'Si quis frater nominatur fornicator,

when the contagion of sin has invaded a whole multitude, it is then necessary for God to visit them, out of mercy, with the severity of his own Divine censure: for in that case exhortations to avoid the company of sinners are not only vain, but pernicious and sacrilegious, because impious and proud, tending more to disturb good men that are weak, than to correct the stubbornness and animosity of the evil." And, therefore, he observes, that St. Paul treated the single incestuous Corinthian, and the multitude that denied the resurrection, in a different way:† "He did not command the Corinthians to make a corporal separation from them, for they were many; not like that one who had married his father's wife, whom he judged worthy of a freer censure and excommunication. There was one way to be taken with a single person, another to cure and heal a multitude; lest, if the people were divided from one another by parties, the wheat also should be rooted up by the mischief of schism.

aut idolis serviens, aut avarus, aut aliquid tale, cum ejusmodi nec cibum quidem simul sumere;' sed ait, 'Ne iterum quum venero ad vos, humiliet me Deus, et lugeam multos ex iis, qui ante peccaverunt, et non egerunt pœnitentiam super immunditia, et luxuria, et fornicatione, quam gesserunt:' per luctum suum potius eos Divino flagello coërcendos minans, quam per illam correptionem, ut ceteri ab eorum conjunctione se contineant. Consequenter enim dicit, 'Ecce tertio hoc veniam ad vos: in ore duorum vel trium testium stabit omne verbum. Prædixi, et prædico sicut præsens secundo, et nunc absens iis, qui ante peccaverunt, et ceteris omnibus, quia, si venero iterum, non parcam; quia probationem quæritis ejus, qui in me loquitur Christus.' Quid aliud dixit heic, 'Non parcam,' nisi quod superius ait, 'Et lugeam multos:' ut luctus ejus impetraret flagellum a Domino, quo illi corripèrentur, qui jam propter multitudinem non poterant ita corripì, ut ab eorum conjunctione se ceteri continerent, et eos erubescere facerent, sicut faciendum est, si quis frater in aliquo ceteris dissimili crimine nominetur? Et revera, si contagio peccandi multitudinem invaserit, Divinæ disciplinæ severa misericordia necessaria est: nam consilia separationis et inania sunt, et perniciosæ atque sacrilegæ: quia et impia et superba fiunt, et plus perturbant infirmos bonos, quam corrigunt animosos malos.

† Aug. lib. cont. Donatistas, post Collat. c. xxi. (p. 613, edit. Basil.) (Bened. ix. p. 409, D.) Non eis præcepit corporalem separationem; multi quippe erant, non sicut ille unus, qui uxorem patris sui habuit, quem liberiore correptione et excommunicatione judicat dignum: longe aliter iste, aliter vitiosa curanda et sananda est multitudo, ne forte, si plebs a plebe separetur, per schismatis nefas etiam triticum eradicetur. Eos ergo, qui jam credebant resurrectionem mortuorum, ab his, qui eam in eodem populo non credebant, non corporaliter Apostolus separat; sed tamen spiritualiter separare non cessat, dicens, 'Nolite seduci, corrumpunt bonos mores colloquia mala.'

And, therefore, the apostle does not enjoin those who believed the resurrection, to separate corporally from those who did not believe it in the same people, though he never ceases to separate them spiritually, by frequent admonitions to beware of joining in their impious opinions." He says further,^k "When such evil men are tolerated in the Church, good men, who are displeased with them, and know not how to mend them, neither dare to root out the tares before the time of the harvest, for fear they should root up the wheat also, do not communicate with their wicked deeds, but with the altar of Christ: so that they are not only not polluted by them, but deserve Divine praise, because, rather than the name of Christ should be blasphemed by horrible schisms, they tolerate for the good of unity, what they otherwise hate for the love of equity." This he shews to be a thing praiseworthy, from various examples both of the Old and New Testament, and the practice of our Saviour, and his apostles, which are too numerous and long to be here inserted. He says more briefly, in another Epistle,^l "That the wicked do not hurt the good in the Church, though they be notoriously evil, if either there be no power to cast them out of communion, or some considerations of preserving peace hinder the doing of it." And, again,^m "Although there be some

^k Aug. Epist. clxii. ad Episc. Donatist. p. 280, (p. 785, edit. Basil.) (Bened. ii. p. 74, C.) Quibus mali placent in unitate, ipsi communicant malis: quibus autem displicent, et eos emendare non possunt, neque ante tempus messis audent zizania eradicare, ne simul eradicent et triticum, non factis eorum, sed altari Christi communicant: ita ut non solum non ab eis maculentur, sed etiam Divinis verbis laudari prædicarique mereantur: quoniam ne nomen Christi per horribilia schismata blasphemetur, pro bono unitatis tolerant, quod pro bono æquitatis oderunt.

^l Ibid. Epist. clxiv. ad Emeritum, (p. 746, edit. Basil.) (Bened. ii. p. 158, D.) Illud non est tacendum, etiam cognitos malos bonis non obesse in ecclesia, si eos a communione prohibendi aut potestas desit, aut aliqua ratio conservandæ pacis impediât.

^m Ibid. Ep. clxvi. (p. 761, edit. Basil.) (Bened. ii. p. 229, E.) Quos corrigere non valemus, etiamsi necessitas cogit pro salute ceterorum, ut Dei sacramenta nobiscum communicent, peccatis tamen eorum non communicemus, quod non fit nisi consentiendo et favendo. Sic enim eos in isto mundo, in quo ecclesia Catholica per omnes gentes diffunditur, quem agrum suum Dominus dicit, tamquam zizania inter triticum, vel in hac unitatis area, tamquam paleam permixtam frumento, vel intra retia verbi et sacramenti tamquam malos pisces cum bonis inclusos, usque ad

whom we cannot correct, and necessity compels us, for the sake of others, to allow them to communicate in the Divine sacraments, yet we do not communicate with them in their sins, which is never done but by favouring and consenting to them. For we only tolerate them in the Church as tares among the wheat, and as chaff mingled with the corn in this floor of unity, and as bad fish among the good inclosed in the nets of the word and sacraments, till the time of harvest, or winnowing, or drawing to shore comes; lest with them we should root up the wheat; or, by separating the corn in the floor before the time, rather expose it to the fowls of the air to devour it, than purge it to be laid up in the garner; or should break the nets by schisms, and, by over-abundant caution to cast out the bad fish, should open a way of pernicious liberty for the rest to return into the sea again. For this reason our Lord made use of these and the like parables to confirm the forbearance of his servants; lest if the good should think themselves to blame for mingling with the evil, they should either destroy the weak by human and hasty dissensions, or themselves become weak, and perish." He pursues the same argument at large in his epistle to Macrobius,^a and his books against Gaudentius,^o and many other places: but what I have already produced, abundantly shews his sense of this matter, and not only his sense, but the concurrent opinion and practice of the whole African Church, both in the time of Cyprian, and the Collation of Carthage, to which he refers. So that, upon the whole matter, their opinion appears plainly to be this, that when a multitude of sinners in the Church made it dangerous to exercise discipline upon them, it was more expe-

tempus messis aut ventilationis aut littoris toleramus, ne propter illos eradicemus et triticum, aut grana nuda ante tempus de area separata, non in horreum mittenda purgemus, sed volatilibus colligenda projiciamus, aut disruptis per schismata retibus, dum quasi malos pisces cavemus, in mare perniciosæ libertatis exeamus. Propter hoc enim his atque aliis similitudinibus Dominus servorum suorum tolerantiam confirmavit, ne dum se boni putant malorum permixtione culpari, per humanas et temerarias dissensiones aut parvulos perdant, aut parvuli pereant.

^a Aug. Ep. cclv. al. cclvi. (Bened. vol. ii. p. 230.)

^o Ibid. cont. Gaudent. lib. iii. cc. iii. v. ix. seq. — It. Epist. lxi. ad Restitutum. Brev. Collat. die iii. c. viii. Vid. Collat. Carth. iii. nn. cclviii. cclxv. et de Fide et Oper. cc. iv. v.

dient to endure the bad among the good, rather than, by trying to purge them out by the severity of censures, to endanger breaking of the nets, and involve the Church in terrible schisms, to the scandal of the weak, and no benefit to the Church, whilst together with the tares they rooted up the wheat also. And this practice, in difficult times, is generally allowed to be expedient by modern writers; among whom the learned reader may consult^p Richerius, Estius, and Lyra; Grotius,^q and Bishop Taylor,^r and Dr. Whitby,^s and Rivet:^t for I know of none but Peter Martyr who maintains the contrary opinion^u against St. Austin. But I return to the ancients, and their practice.

^p Richer. de Potestat. Eccles. in Rebus Temporal. lib. iii. c. iv. p. 294.—Estius, in 2 Cor. x. 6. Accipitur illa excommunicatio de iis, qui adhuc inter Corinthios magnis peccatis erant obnoxii; in quos, quia multi erant, non facile poterat exerceri disciplina per excommunicationem, &c.—Lyra, Gloss. in Matt. xii. 29. Hic datur locus penitentiae, et monemur non cito amputare: quoniam qui errat hodie, cras forte defendet veritatem. Si ergo modo avelleretur: triticum quod futurum erat, eradicaretur. . . . Ibi patienter tolerandi mali, ubi aliqui inveniuntur, quibus adjuventur boni. Augustinus: 'multitudo non est excommunicanda: nec princeps populi,' &c.

^q Grot. in 2 Cor. x. 6. Neque enim duris remediis locus est, ubi tota ecclesia in morbo cubat.

^r Taylor, Duct. Dubit. book iii. chap. iv. p. 610. The king nor the people are not to be excommunicated, is an old rule. For if the whole multitude be excommunicate, with whom shall we communicate? If great parts of them be, they plainly make a schism, if they unwillingly suffer the censure.

^s Whitby, Protest. Reconcil. part. ii. p. 257.

^t Rivet. Synops. Pur. Theol. Disput. xlviii. n. xxx. p. 766, edit. Lugd. Bat. 1625. Si sola prava vita, non ex doctrina prava, sed contra doctrinam sanam magnam gregis partem invaserit, ex sententia Augustini (lib. iii. contra Epistolam Parmeniani, et alibi adversus Donatistas), nec secessione ab eis, nec excommunicatione, sed precibus, gemitu, adhortationibus, reprehensionibus, comminationibus, bonis exemplis, et similibus remediis tantum utendum: quemadmodum videmus prophetas et pios sacerdotes his solis armis in ecclesia Israelitica esse usos, quod et probat ex loco 2 Cor. x., quod hæc potestas non ad destructionem sed ad ædificationem sit data; et ex parabola zizaniorum, quæ Christus evelli noluit sed ferri; quando metus est, ne triticum eadem opera evellatur ac perdat; Matth. xiii. 29.

^u Petr. Martyr. Loc. Commun. lib. v. c. v. n. xii. p. 784, (tom. i. n. xiii. seq. p. 1449, seq. edit. Basil.)

SECT. VII.— *The Innocent never involved among the Guilty, in Ecclesiastical Censures. The Original and Novelty of Popish Interdicts.*

Where, among other prudent cautions observed in this matter, we may remark their wisdom and piety in managing this spiritual sword, so as it might affect offenders only, and not involve the innocent and guiltless in the same condemnation. That which has been so common and so tyrannical a practice with the popes of later ages, to lay whole Churches and nations under interdict, and forbid them the use of all sacraments, for the faults of a single criminal, was so much unknown to the ancients, that St. Austin was amazed, when he heard of a young rash African bishop, who, in his warm zeal for the single offence of one Classicianus, and that not evidently proved, had anathematized both him and his whole family together. Complaint of the thing being made to St. Austin, he thus writes to the bishop, to expostulate with him upon the fact, in these terms :^v “ Being in great concern of mind, and my heart fluctuating, as in a tempest, within me, I could not but write to your Charity, to desire you to inform me (if you have any certain grounds of reason, or authority of Scripture, for your practice), how a son can rightly be anathematized for his father’s sin, or a wife for her husband’s, or a servant for his master’s; or why a child, that is yet unborn, if he happens to be born in the family while it lies under anathema, may not have the benefit of the laver of regeneration in the article of death? For this is not a

^v Aug. Epist. lxxv. ad Auxilium, (Bened. vol. ii. p. 666, A. B.) Non mediocriter aestuans, cogitationibus magna cordis tempestate fluctuantibus, apud Caritatem tuam tacere non potui: ut, si habes de hac re sententiam, certis rationibus vel Scripturarum testimoniis exploratam, nos quoque docere digneris, quomodo recte anathemetur pro patris peccato filius, aut pro mariti uxor, aut pro domini servus, aut quisquam in domo etiam nondum natus, si eodem tempore, quo universa domus est anathemate obligata, nascatur, nec ei possit per lavacrum regenerationis in mortis periculo subveniri. Neque enim hæc corporalis est poena, qua legimus quosdam contemtores Dei cum suis omnibus, qui ejusdem impietatis participes non fuerunt, pariter interfectos. Tunc quidem ad terrorem viventium mortalia corpora perimebantur, quandoque utique moritura. Spiritalis autem poena, qua fit quod scriptum est, ‘ Quæ ligaveris in terra, erunt ligata et in celo,’ animas obligat, de quibus dictum est, ‘ Anima patris mea est, et anima filii mee

corporal punishment, with which we read some despisers of God were slain, with their whole families, though the families were not partakers in their crimes. Then, indeed, mortal bodies, which must otherwise shortly have died, were slain for to strike a terror into the living. But spiritual punishment, of which it is said, 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven,' this also binds souls, of whom it is written, 'The soul of the father is mine, and the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die.' For my part, I can give no just reason for such anathemas; and therefore I have never dared to use them, even when I have been most highly provoked by the clamorous crime of some, committed insolently against the Church. If God has revealed it unto you, I despise not your youth, but shall be ready to learn how we can give a just reason either to God or man, for inflicting spiritual punishments upon innocent souls, for the sin of another, from whom they derived no original sin, as they do from Adam, in whom all have sinned. But if you can give no good reason for it, why do you that out of an unadvised and precipitate commotion of mind, in defence of which, if any man asks you a reason, you have nothing to answer?" From this decent reproof given to the headstrong passion of this young bishop, and his intemperate zeal in anathematizing a whole family for the crime of the master only, we may conclude there was no such allowed practice in the Church in St. Austin's time, as

est. Anima, quæ peccaverit, ipsa morietur.' Audisti fortasse aliquos magni nominis sacerdotes cum domo sua quempiam anathemassee peccantium? Sed forte si essent interrogati, reperirentur idonei reddere inde rationem. Ego autem, quoniam si quis ex me quærat, utrum recte fiat, quid ei respondeam, non invenio. Numquam hoc facere ausus sum, quum de quorundam facinoribus, immaniter adversus ecclesiam perpetratis, gravissime permoverer. Sed si tibi forte quoniam juste fiat, Dominus revelavit, nequaquam juvenilem ætatem tuam, et honoris ecclesiastici rudimenta contemno. En adsum, senex a juvene, et episcopus tot annorum a collega nec dum anniculo paratus sum discere, quomodo vel Deo vel hominibus justam possumus reddere rationem, si animas innocentes pro scelere alieno, ex quo non trahunt, sicut ex Adam (in quo omnes peccaverunt) originale peccatum, spiritali supplicio puniamus. . . . Si ergo de hac re potes reddere rationem, utinam et nobis rescribendo præstes, ut possimus et nos: si autem non potes, quid tibi est inconsulta commotione animi facere, unde, si fueris interrogatus, rectam responsionem non vales invenire?

excommunicating the innocent with the guilty, though the innocent might have some near relation to, or unavoidable dependance on, the offending parties : much less was it customary then to lay whole bodies, Churches, or nations under interdict, and forbid them the use of the sacraments, merely to curb or restrain the contumacy of others, of which they were wholly innocent, and noways partakers. Which was a monstrous and novel abuse of discipline, peculiar to the tyrannical times of the papacy, and utterly unknown to former ages. Baronius indeed brings a single instance of it out of the Annals of France, where it is said,* “ That Pope Agapetus (an. 535), threatened King Clotarius to put his kingdom under interdict, unless he made satisfaction for a barbarous and sacrilegious murder committed by him in the church, upon one Gualter de Yvetot, who carried the pope’s letters of recommendation to him.” But as this story is only told by modern writers, such as Du Haillan, whom Baronius quotes, and Gaguinus, Gilius, and Tilius, added by Spondanus, and has not the authority of any ancient writers ; and has something also in the narration itself, which destroys its credit with judicious men ; Spondanus owns there are many learned men who reject it as a fable,^x prevailing only by the credulity of the French nation for many ages. And therefore it is not worthy to be mentioned as a piece of ancient history in the case before us.

Some date the original of interdicts from the time of

* Baron. an. 535, in Appendice, tom. vii. p. 9, (p. 264, edit. Antwerp. 1658.) Gualterus cum litteris Suessionum, ubi rex degebat, die Veneris sancta, advenit ; et quum rex in sacello suo sacris adesset, crucemque adorare vellet, Gualterus prædictum sacellum intravit, pontificisque litteras regi obtulit. Rex autem prima fronte Gualterum non agnovit propter diurnam illius e regno absentiam : sed acceptis et perlectis litteris ipsoque agnito, gladium suum exeruit ; vel ut aliis placet, militis cujusdam adstantis ensem corripuit, et Gualterum interfecit. Pontifex crudeli hoc facinore accensus, regi mandavit, ut culpam illam emendaret, alioquin regnum ipsius interdictum fore, &c.

^x Spondan. Epit. Baron. an. 535, n. xviii. Hanc historiam regni de Yvetot, præter Halianum, ex quo illam descripsit Baronius, æque recitant, qui ante illum scripserunt, Gaguinus, Gilius, Tilius, et si qui alii eorundem temporum rerum Franciarum auctores : quum tamen vetustiores illi eam silentio prætermiserint. Qua ratione, et quod se ipsam narratio aliqua ex parte destruere videatur ; non desunt hodie, qui inter fabulas recenseant, quæ constanti credulitate per multa sæcula obtinuit in Gallia. (Mogunt. 1618.)

Alexander III., about the year 1160. And indeed, about this time, they began to be very frequent. Habertus says,⁷ Morinus carries them a little higher to the time of Pope Hildebrand, or Gregory VII., who is most likely to be the father of them,⁸ for they are sometimes mentioned in his Epistles. Habertus himself pretends to make them as ancient as St. Basil. But the place out of Basil's Epistles,⁹ says no more, but that "when a whole Church make themselves partakers of another man's sins, they may be censured all together." Which is very far from the indiscriminating censure of an interdict, which condemns a whole nation, and that commonly for no crime, but rather their duty, for adhering conscientiously to their natural allegiance due to their

⁷ Habert. Archieratic. p. 746. De interdicto apud Græcos aliquid e penu nostra. Duplex interdictum, quo Divina officia actione, ut inquit, et passione prohibentur, scio triplex a doctoribus distingui, locale, personale, et ex utraque compositum. Sed locum et gentem proprie respicit. Illius epochen, quod quidam ante tempora Alexandri tertii inauditum interdictum dixerint, recte antiquiorem in Occidente ostendit Morinus ex Ivone Carnot. ep. l. et Gregorio Septimo, lib. i. ep. lxxxi. et lib. ii. ep. v. et aliis, immo ex Concilio Lemovicensi, an. 1034, apud Baronium. Verum longe antiquiorem esse interdicti usum apud Græcos, ostendimus ex S. Basilio. Locus eximius et observatione dignissimus est epistola ad episcopum quemdam ccxlv., in qua agit de quadam puella rapta parentibus restituenda, raptore una cum consciis excommunicando per triennium, et si raptam reddere negaverint, pago ipso sacris interdicendo. Τὴν μὲν παῖδα, ὡς οὐκ ἐν ὕμῃ, ἀφιλόμηνος πάσης εὐτοκίας ἀποκατάστησεν τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ αὐτὸν δὲ ἐκείνῳ ἱερέϊσιν τῶν ἐκχῶν καὶ ἐκκήρυκτον ποίησεν, καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ὑποδιξαμένην τὴν ἀρετῶν καὶ φυλάξασαν, ἥτοι ὑπερμαχήσασαν καὶ αὐτὴν ἔξω τῶν ἐκχῶν πανδημὴν ποίησεν.

⁸ Gregor. VII. lib. i. ep. lxxxi. Confrater noster Theodoricus Viridunensis episcopus, ut sæpe nobis relatum est, habitatores loci apud monasterium quoddam sancti Michaelis infra parochiam suam, ad quasdam novas consuetudines sua virtute et potentia flectere et coercere diu conatus est, videlicet ut cum litanis majorem ecclesiam, hoc est, suam episcopalem sedem, simul congregati singulis annis visitarent. Quod quum illi inusitatum, ne forte ad alterius novæ exactionis occasionem darent, pati renuerent, Divinum ibi officium fieri penitus interdixit, &c. — Lib. ii. ep. v. Quod si vos audire noluerit (rex Franciæ) et abjecto timore Dei contra regium decus, contra suam et populi salutem, in duritia cordis sui perstiterit, apostolicæ animadversionis gladium nequaquam eum diutius effugere posse, quasi ex ore nostro sibi notificare. Propter quod et vos apostolica auctoritate commoniti atque constricti, matrem vestram sanctam Romanam et apostolicam ecclesiam debita fide et obedientia imitemini, et ab ejus vos obsequio atque communione penitus separantes, per universam Franciam omne Divinum officium publice celebrari interdicit, &c.

⁹ Basil. Ep. ccxlii. See before, note (7).

lawful sovereigns, when the pope is pleased to excommunicate and depose them, under pretence of the plenitude of ecclesiastical power, as any one that would write the history of interdicts, might easily demonstrate. Whatever St. Basil meant, it is certain he had not this in his thoughts: neither was it the usual practice of the Church to anathematize whole bodies of men, though guilty, unless it was for terror's sake; as has been shewn in the foregoing section.

SECT. VIII.— *The Danger of Excommunicating Innocent Persons.*

As to innocent persons, all care imaginable was taken, that the censures of the Church should not be abused by any indiscreet application of them to the condemnation of the guiltless. In which case, an unjust sentence was thought to recoil upon the head of him that executed it. Thus Firmilian told Pope Stephen, that in cutting off others who did not deserve it, he cut off himself:^b “Be not deceived; for he is the true schismatic, who makes himself an apostate from the communion of the ecclesiastical unity. For while you think you can excommunicate all others, you only excommunicate yourself from them.” In like manner, Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, answered Pope Victor, when he threatened to excommunicate him and all the Asiatic Churches for not observing Easter in the same manner as they did at Rome:^c “He was not afraid of his menaces,” he told him, “for he had learned of those that were greater than he, to obey God rather than man.” And Eusebius adds, “That when Victor persisted still in this headstrong resolution, Irenæus and several other bishops wrote ‘very sharply’ to him, πληκτικώτερον, reproving him for his unwarrantable abuse of the Church censures.” It is a noted saying in the

^b Firmil. Ep. lxxv. ap. Cyprian. (p. 326, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Peccatum, quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim te ipsum. Noli te fallere: Siquidem ille est vere schismaticus, qui se a communione ecclesiasticæ unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti. (Oxon. 1682, p. 228.)

^c Polycrat. Epist. ad Victor. ap. Euseb. lib. v. c. xxiv. Οὐ πτόρομαι ἐπὶ ταῖς καταπληροσσομένοις· οἱ γὰρ ἐμοῦ μίζοντες ἐιρήκασιν, Πιθαρχῆν δὲ Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις. — Vid. sis Aug. de Vera Religione, c. vi. tot.

Index to the works of Pope Gregory I., upon this account,^d “If any one excommunicate another unjustly, he does not condemn him, but himself.” Though the Romanists commonly magnify another saying of his, transcribed into the canon-law,^e “That the sentence of the shepherd is to be dreaded, whether it be just or unjust,” which can certainly never be true but in a very doubtful case. It is much more to the purpose, what Gratian, in the same question, alleges from St. Austin,^f “That a man had need be very careful whom he binds on earth: for unjust bonds will be loosed by the justice of heaven: and not only so, but turn to the condemnation of him that imposes them: for though rash judgment often hurts not him who is rashly judged;^g yet the rashness of him that judges rashly, will turn to his own disadvantage. In the meantime,^h it is no detriment to a man to have his name struck out of the diptychs of the Church by human ignorance, if an evil conscience do not blot him out of the Book of Life.” Thus far St. Austin, in several places alleged by Gratian, to which may be added what he cites out of the foresaid place of Gregory,ⁱ “That he deprives himself of the power of binding and loosing, who exercises it according to his arbitrary will, and not according to the deserts of those that are under his government.” He means, that an excommunication, unjustly pronounced, is of no force

^d Gregor. lib. ii. ep. xxvi. Si quis illicite quemquam excommunicat, semetipsum, non illum condemnat.

^e Ibid. Hom. xxvi. in Evangel. ap. Gratian. Decret. caus. xi. quæst. iii. c. i. Sententia pastoris, sive justa, sive injusta fuerit, timenda est.

^f Aug. Serm. xvi. de Verbis Domini, ap. Gratian. Decret. c. xlviii. (Bened. 1700, vol. v. p. 309, E.) Cœpisti habere fratrem tuum tamquam publicanum: ligas illum in terra, sed ut juste alliges, vide. Nam injusta vincula dirumpit justitia.

^g Ibid. de Serm. Domini in Monte, lib. ii. c. xxix. ap. Gratian. Decret. c. xlix. Temerarium judicium plerumque nihil nocet ei, de quo temere judicatur. Ei autem, qui temere judicat, ipsa temeritas necesse est ut noceat.

^h Ibid. Ep. cxxxvii. ap. Gratian. Decret. c. l. (vol. ii. p. 139, E.) Quid obest homini, quod ex illa tabula non vult eum recitari humana ignorantia, si de libro vivorum non eum delet iniqua conscientia?

ⁱ Gregor. Hom. xxvi. in Evangel. ap. Gratian. c. lx. Ipse ligandi atque solvendi potestate se privat, qui hanc pro suis voluntatibus et non pro subjectorum moribus exercet. — Gelas. ibid. ap. Gratian. c. xlvi. Cui est illata sententia, deponat errorem: sed si injusta est, tanto eam curare non debet, quanto apud Deum et ecclesiam ejus neminem potest iniqua gravare sententia. Ita ergo ea se non absolvi desideret, qua se nullatenus perspicit obligatum.

against one that deserves it not; neither is the absolution of an impenitent sinner any better; because they are both done *clave errante*,^j ‘by a misapplication of the keys;’ in which case, as the Gloss upon the Law words it, “the party so bound is not bound before God:” for it often happens that, by this means, a man is excommunicated out of the Church-militant, who, notwithstanding, is in the Church-triumphant. “And such excommunications,” says Cardinal Tolet,^k “bind neither before God nor the Church.”

SECT. IX. — *No one to be Excommunicated without being first heard, and allowed to speak for Himself.*

Now, to prevent this inconvenience, the ancient Church prescribed several useful rules to be observed in the matter of excommunication. For, besides that ordinarily no one was to be censured without a previous admonition, as has been noted before,^l it was likewise ordered, that no man should be condemned in his absence, without being allowed liberty to answer for himself, unless he contumaciously refused to appear. “Let ecclesiastical judges beware,” says the Council of Carthage,^m “that they never pronounce sentence against any one that is absent, when his cause is under debate: otherwise the sentence shall be void, and they shall give an account of their action to the synod.” Upon this ground, St. Austin refutes the censure which the Donatists pretended to pass upon Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage,ⁿ because he was absent, and never examined by them before they proceeded to condemn him.

^j Gloss. in Extravagant. Joan. xxii. tit. xiv. c. v. p. 160, (p. 175, litt. ^(h)), edit. Antwerp. 1562.) ‘Solutum et in cælis’] sed hoc intellige clave non errante: alias enim si ligando vel solvendo erraret, ligatus vel solutus quis non dicitur quoad Deum. Frequenter enim fit, ut qui per ecclesiam militantem foras mittitur, intus sit, scilicet, in ecclesia triumphanti: et ille foris est, scilicet extra ecclesiam triumphantem, qui intus, scilicet, in ecclesia militanti, retineri videtur.

^k Tolet. Instruct. Sacerdot. lib. i. c. x. p. 35. Iniqua sententia, nec apud Deum nec apud ecclesiam quemquam gravat.

^l Chap. ii. sect. vi.

^m Conc. Carth. IV. c. xxx. (Labbe. vol. ii. p. 1203.) Caveant iudices ecclesie, ne absente eo, cujus causa ventilatur, sententiam proferant, quia irrita erit, imo et causam in synodo profecto dabunt. — Vid. plura ap. Gratian. caus. iii. quæst. ix.

ⁿ Aug. Ep. clxii. p. 279. Si nec vituperari, nec corripui nisi interrogatum Spi-

SECT. X.—*Nor without Legal Conviction, either by his own Confession; or credible Evidence of Witnesses, against whom there was no Exception; or such Notoriety of the Fact as made a Man liable to Excommunication ipso facto, without any formal Denunciation.*

Another rule observed in this case was, “That no one should be excommunicated, unless he stood legally convicted of his crime.” Which might be three ways; 1. By his own confession. 2. By the credible evidence of such witnesses as could not justly be excepted against, or suspected of bearing false testimony. 3. By such notoriety of the fact as made a man liable to excommunication *ipso facto*, without any further process, or formal denunciation: as in the case of those that fell by offering sacrifice in time of persecution: here was no need, in this case, either of their own confession, or conviction by witnesses: for their crime was notorious to all the world, and it needed no formal process, or examination of witnesses, to condemn them: neither was there any need of a formal sentence of excommunication to be pronounced against them: for they stood excommunicated *ipso facto*, as learned men style it;° the fact itself, being evident and notorious to all, was sufficient to declare them excommunicate, as having forfeited all right to the privileges of Christian communion. In other cases, where the matter was not so clear, they required either the confession of the party himself, or the legal evidence of unexceptionable witnesses. Thus St. Austin declares:† “We cannot exclude any one from communion, except he either voluntarily confess his crime himself, or be noted and convicted in some secular or ecclesiastical judgment. For who dare to assume both to him-

ritus Sanctus voluit, quanto sceleratius non vituperati aut corrépti, sed omnino damnati sunt, qui de suis criminibus nihil absentes interrogari potuerunt? (Bened. ii. p. 71, A.) — It. Sermon. xxii. de Verbis Apostoli. Damnatus est Cæcilianus, absens primo, deinde a traditoribus, &c.

° Cave's Primitive Christianity, part iii. chap. v.

† Aug. Hom. l. de Pœnitent. tom. x. p. 207. Nos a communione prohibere quemquam non possumus, nisi aut sponte confessum, aut in aliquo sive sæculari sive ecclesiastico iudicio nominatum atque convictum. Quis enim sibi utrumque audeat adsumere, ut cuiquam ipse sit accusator et iudex?

self, to be both accuser and judge?" "We are not to exclude any man," says Pope Innocent,^q "upon bare suspicions." "Where the crime is not evident," says Origen,^r "we can cast no man out of the Church, lest, while we root out the tares, we root up the wheat also." And the same reason is given by St. Austin in the place now cited. Justinian^s confirmed this rule of the Church by a civil sanction, not only forbidding all bishops and presbyters to segregate any man from the communion before his crime was evidently proved against him; but ordering such a one immediately to be restored to communion; and the minister who suspended him, to be suspended himself by his superior, *ut quod injuste fecit, juste sustineat*, 'that he may justly suffer the same punishment, which he unjustly inflicted on the other.' As, therefore, they were not to excommunicate a whole multitude, though their crimes were notorious; so neither were they to excommunicate a single criminal, unless his crime could be made evident to the multitude, that they might detest and abhor it: then the severity of discipline was not to sleep,^t according to St. Austin's rule. "If the criminal was accused, and also convicted, by evident proofs and testimony before the judge, then the judge might

^q Innocent. Ep. iii. c. iv. Non facile quisquam ex suspicionibus abstinetur. Probatione cessante, vindictæ ratio conquiescit. (Labbe. ii. 1256.)

^r Origen. Hom. xxi. in Josuam, tom. i. p. 328, (p. 203, edit. Paris. 1604.) Ubi peccatum non est evidens, ejicere de ecclesia neminem possumus, ne forte eradicantes zizania, eradicemus simul cum ipsis etiam triticum.

^s Justin. Novel. cxliii. c. xi. Πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπισκόποις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἀπαγορεύομεν ἀφορίζειν τινὰ τῆς ἁγίας κοινωνίας, πρὶν ἢ αἰτία διχθῇ, δι' ἣν οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ κανόνες τοῦτο γινίσθαι κελεύουσιν· εἰ δὲ τις παρὰ ταῦτα τῆς ἁγίας κοινωνίας τινὰ χωρίσει, ἐκείνος μὲν ὅς ἀδίκως ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας ἐχωρίσθη, λυγμένον τοῦ χωρισμοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ μίζοντος ἱερέως, τῆς ἁγίας ἀξιούσθω κοινωνίας· ὁ δὲ ἀδίκως τινὰ τῆς ἁγίας κοινωνίας χωρίσει τολμήσας, πᾶσι τρόποις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως, ὃν εἴτακται, χωρίσθῃται τῆς κοινωνίας, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ἐκείνος συνῖδαι, ἵνα, ὅποτε ἀδίκως ἐποίησε, δικαίως ὑπομείνῃ.

^t Aug. cont. ep. Parmen. lib. iii. c. ii. (Bened. ix. p. 42, F.) Quando cujusque crimen notum est et omnibus execrabile apparet . . . non dormiat severitas disciplinæ.

^u Ibid. Serm. xxiv. de Verbis Apost. (Bened. v. p. 559.) ap. Gratian. caus. xxiii. quæst. iv. c. xi. Si judicandi potestatem accepisti, ecclesiastica regula, si apud te accusatur, si veris documentis testibusque convincitur, coërce, corrippe, excommunica, degrada.

proceed against him lawfully, to punish, correct, excommunicate, or degrade him. But otherwise, without such legal conviction, no bishop could suspend a clerk from communion, unless he contumaciously refused to appear to have his cause examined before him." "And this," St. Austin says,^v "was determined in council for greater security against arbitrary proceedings." And it is observable, in this case, that the canons never allowed the testimony of one single witness as sufficient evidence to convict a criminal;^w grounding upon that rule in the Divine law, "In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established." Nay, though it were a bishop or presbyter that accused any man, barely upon his own knowledge, his testimony was not sufficient ground to proceed against him to excommunication. For, as we have heard St. Austin say but just now, "No man could be both accuser and judge." And, therefore, it was provided by the Council of Vaison,^x "That though a bishop knew a man to be a criminal, yet if he alone was privy to his crime, and could make no other proof it, he should not so much as publish it, but deal privately with the man, by admonition to bring him to repentance. But if, notwithstanding his admonition, he would persist pertinacious, and offer himself publicly to communicate, the bishop should not have power to excommunicate or cast him wholly out of the Church, but only enjoin him to recede for a time, out of respect to the bishop's person, whilst he continued in the communion

^v Aug. Ep. cxxxvii. In episcoporum concilio constitutum est, nullum clericum, qui nondum convictus est, suspendi a communione debere, nisi ad causam suam examinandam se non præsentaverit. (Bened. ii. p. 139, D.)

^w Can. Apost. lxxiv. (Labb. vol. i. p. 41.) *Εἰς μαρτυρίαν τὴν κατ' ἐπισκόπου αἰρετικὸν μὴ προσδίδχισθαι, ἀλλὰ μὴδὲ πιστὸν ἵνα μόνον ἐπὶ στόματος γὰρ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων σταθῇσται πᾶν ῥῆμα.* See also Conc. Illerdens. ap. Crabium ex Ivone, lib. v.

^x Conc. Vasens. II. c. viii. Si tantum episcopus alieni sceleris se conscium novit, quamdiu probare non potest, nihil proferat; sed cum ipso ad compunctionem ejus secretis correptionibus elaboret. Qui si correptus pertinacior fuerit, et se communioni publicæ ingesserit, etiamsi episcopus in redarguendo illo, quem reum judicat, probationibus deficiat, indemnatus licet, ab his qui nihil sciunt, secedere ad tempus pro persona majoris auctoritatis jubeatur, illo quamdiu probari nihil potest, in communione omnium, præterquam ejus, qui eum reum judicat, permanente. (Labb. vol. iii. p. 1458.)

of all those who knew nothing of his offences." And even this was a greater deference paid to the single testimony of a bishop, than was allowed in the African Churches. For there, by a rule of the seventh Council of Carthage, made in St. Austin's time,⁷ if a man confessed his crime to a bishop, and afterwards denied it, the bishop was not to think he had any injury done him, if his single evidence was not taken by his fellow-bishops to the man's condemnation: and if in such a case the bishop presumed to excommunicate him, upon a scruple of conscience that he could not communicate with such a one, the bishop himself was not to communicate with other bishops, that he might learn to be more cautious in saying that against any man, which he could not prove by any other evidence but his own testimony. So tender were these holy bishops of condemning any man without sufficient and legal evidence to convict him. St. Austin, who was present in this Council, tells a remarkable story of a case of this nature, that happened between Boniface, one of his presbyters, and a man that was accused by him.⁸ Having no sufficient evidence, but only their simple testimony on either side, he would not determine the matter between them, but ordered them both to go to the sepulchre of Felix the martyr, in hopes that the cause might be decided by some apparent miracle and Divine judgment, where human judgment could not determine it, as he says he had known it done in a case of theft at Milan. He adds, that both the

⁷ Conc. Carth. VII. c. v. (Labb. vol. ii. p. 1604.) Placuit, ut si quando episcopus dicit, aliquem sibi soli proprium crimen fuisse confessum, atque ille neget; non putet ad injuriam suam episcopus pertinere, quod illi soli non creditur: et si scrupulo propriæ conscientiæ se dicit neganti nolle communicare, quamdiu excommunicato non communicaverit suus episcopus, eidem episcopo ab aliis non communicetur episcopis, ut magis caveat episcopus, ne dicat in quemquam, quod aliis documentis convincere non potest. (L. ii. 1134.)—Cod. Afric. c. cxxxii. 'Ομοίως ἤρουν, ἵνα ἰάν ποτε ἐπίσκοπος λίγη τινὰ αὐτῷ μόνῳ τὸ ἴδιον ἔγκλημα ὁμολογήσαι, καὶ καίνας ἀρῆνται, μὴ λογίσσεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος εἰς ἴδιον ὕβριν συντίσιν, ὅτι αὐτὰς μόνος οὐ πιστεύεται, εἰ καὶ τῷ σκινδαλμῷ τῆς ἰδίας συνιδήσεις λίγαι, μὴ θίλειν ἑαυτὸν κοινοῦν τῷ ἀρεομύνῳ.—Can. cxxxiii. 'Εφ' ὅσον τῷ ἀφωρισμῷ μὴ κοινοῦν ὁ ἴδιος ἐπίσκοπος, τῷ αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἄλλοι μὴ συγκοινωνήσουσιν ἐπίσκοποι, ὥστε μᾶλλον παραφυλάττεσθαι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, μὴ λίγιν κατὰ τινος, ὅστις ἀποδιῆται μὴ ἰλίγξει παρ' ἑτέροις.—Aug. Hom. xvi. de Verbis Domini. See note (*).

⁸ Aug. Ep. cxxxvii. tom. ii. opp. pp. 656–658, edit. Basil. 1569, (Bened. ii.)

ecclesiastical and civil law forbade the condemning any man upon the evidence of a single witness, as insufficient to convict him. The ecclesiastical law we have already heard ; and for the civil law, it is probable he refers to a decree of Constantine now extant in the Theodosian Code,^a which precisely enjoins all judges not to determine any cause upon the evidence of a single witness, though it were even a senator that was the deponent. Which Gothofred compares to a noted saying among the old Romans, related by Plutarch, "That it was not right to give credit to one witness, though it were Cato himself that gave testimony." Whence Gothofred also,^b with great reason, concludes that the law which goes under the name of Constantine, at the end of the Theodosian Code, allowing the single testimony of a bishop to be good evidence, is a spurious law (though it be inserted into the Capitular of Charles the Great,^c and Gratian's *Decretales*), because it contradicts all other laws, both ecclesiastical and civil, upon this subject.

It is worth observing further, that to secure the innocence of virtuous men from being unjustly traduced and censured, there were many laws forbidding the testimony of heretics, or other suspected and infamous persons, to be accepted in judgment : of which, because I have had occasion to discourse^d elsewhere, I say no more in this place. But from all that has now been said it sufficiently appears, that though the ancients were very strict and severe in their dis-

^a Cod. Theod. lib. xi. tit. xxxix. de Fide Testium, leg. iii. Manifeste sancimus, ut unius omnino testis responsio non audiatur, etiam si præclaræ curiæ honore præfulgeat. (Lugd. 1665, vol. iv. p. 322.)

^b Gothofr. in Cod. Theod. lib. xi. tit. xxxix. leg. iii. (p. 323.) Et tamen sub Constantini Magni nomine proponitur lex i. infra, de Episcopali Judicio, qua definitur, 'Testimonium etiam ab uno licet episcopo perhibitum, omnes judices indubitanter accipere oportere, nec alium audiri ; quum testimonium episcopi a qualibet parte fuerit repromissum ;' additis his, 'Illud est enim veritatis auctoritate firmatum, illud incorruptum, quod in sacrosancto homine conscientia mentis inlibatæ protulerit.' Idque ita relatum Capitular. lib. vi. c. cclxxxi. et a Gratiano, c. omnes, xi. quæst. i. Verum ut de tota leg. illa, ad eam dixi ; ita et hoc suspectum est. Nam et id contrarium est prementoriis hujus leg. verbis, quæ sub extremis Constantini annis ab eo lata est, et Dei verbo : quod Constantinus M. ut alias, ita et heic sequutus est, Deut. xix. 15. Vide sis eundem ad lib. xvi. tit. xii. leg. i. p. 306.

^c Capitular. lib. vi. c. cclxxxi. — Gratian. caus. xi. quæst. i. c. xxxvi.

^d Book v. chap. i. sect. v.

cipline, yet they were equally cautious that the severity of it should not affect the innocent: and every man was presumed to be innocent, till a just and legal proof could be made against him. Nor was this a harm to the Church; it being better that some vicious men should escape, than that virtuous men should be exposed to the greatest of all punishments upon bare suspicion, or the arbitrary pleasure of any one man; for which reason also, as I have often noted, the Church still allowed an appeal from the unjust sentence of any bishop to the re-examination of a provincial council.

SECT. XI.—*Excommunication not ordinarily inflicted upon Minors, or Children under Age.*

Another sort of persons, whom the censures of the Church seldom or never touched, were minors, or children under age: there being more proper punishments thought fit for them, such as fatherly rebukes and corporal correction: and to inflict the highest censures upon such, was rather thought a lessening of authority, and bringing contempt upon the discipline of the Church. Therefore Socrates observes of Arsenius, the Egyptian abbot,* “That he was never used to excommunicate any junior monks, but only those that had made a greater proficiency: for a young man, when he is excommunicated, only becomes a despiser.” Palladius observes the same of the discipline of the great Church of Mount Nitria,^f “That they had three whips hanged up in the church: one for chastising the offending monks, another for robbers, and a third for strangers that came accidentally, and behaved themselves disorderly among them.” So in the rule of Isidore of Seville one article is,^g “That they who

* Socrat. lib. iv. c. xxiii. (Vales. p. 191, B.) Ἀρσένιος τοὺς τῶν νίων πταίσαντας οὐκ ἀφώριζεν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς προκόψαντας· λίγων ὅτι ὁ νίος ἀφορισθὲς, καταφρονητὴς γίνεται· ὁ δὲ προκόψας τῆς ἐκ τοῦ ἀφορισμοῦ ἰδύτης ταχίαν λαμβάνει τὴν αἰσθησιν.

^f Pallad. Hist. Lausiaca. c. vi. Ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ τῆς Νιτρίας ἐκκλησία μία ἐστὶ μεγίστη· ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τρεῖς φοίνικες ἰστέουσιν, ἕκαστος ἔχει μέσσιγα ἑφ' ἑαυτοῦ περιμακύνει καὶ ὁ μὴν ἐστὶν εἰς ἱστοροφὴν τῶν μοναχῶν τῶν πταίωντων· ὁ δὲ, εἰς τιμωρίαν ληστῶν, ἰάνγι ἐμπίσσωσι ποτί· ὁ δὲ, εἰς διόρθωσιν τῶν περιτυγχανόντων καὶ ἐκπαισσκόντων οἷσις δῆποτε σφάλμασιν.

^g Isidor. Regul. c. xvii. In minori ætate constituti non sunt coercendi sententia excommunicationis, sed pro quantitate negligentiae congruis emendandi sunt plagis.

were in their minority, should not be punished with excommunication, but, according to the quality of their negligence or offence, be corrected with congruous stripes." The late author of the *Historia Flagellantium*^b cites the rule of Macarius,ⁱ and that of St. Benedict,^j and Aurelian,^k and Gregory the Great, to the same purpose.^l And Cyprian, in the Life of Cæsarius Arelatensis, says,^m "That bishop observed this method both with slaves and freemen, that when they were to be scourged for their faults, they should suffer forty stripes, save one, according as the law appointed." The Council of Agdeⁿ orders the same punishment not only for junior monks, but also for the inferior clergy. And the Council of Mascon^o particularly insists upon the number of forty stripes, save one. The Council of Vannes^p repeats the canon of Agde. And the Council of Epone^q speaks of

^b Histor. Flagellant. c. v. et vi.

ⁱ Macar. Regul. c. xv. (In Hist. Flagell. p. 145.) Si aliquis deprehensus fuerit in risu et scurrilitate sermonis, sicut ait apostolus, quæ ad rem non pertinent, jubemus hujusmodi duarum hebdomadarum spatio, in nomine Domini omni flagello humilitatis coerceri. Idem: Si quis vero monachus furtum fecerit, quod potius sacrilegium dici potest, id censuimus ordinandum, ut junior virgis cæsus, tanti criminis reus neutiquam officium clericatus excipiat, &c.

^j Bened. Regul. c. lxx. (ibid. p. 156.) Ut nulli liceat quemquam fratrum excommunicare aut cædere, nisi cui potestas ab abbate data fuerit. Infantibus vero usque ad quintum decimum annum ætatis, disciplinæ diligentia adhibeatur et custodia sit omnibus.

^k Aurel. Regul. c. xli. (ibid. p. 172.) Pro qualibet culpa si necesse fuerit flagelli accipere disciplinam, numquam legitimus excedatur numerus, id est, triginta novem.

^l Gregor. Magn. lib. ix. ep. lxxvi. (ibid. p. 104.) Quia ergo nequitia sine digna non debet ultione transire, supra scriptum Paschasium episcopum volumus admoneri, ut eundem Hilarium prius subdiaconatus, quo indignus fungitur, privet officio atque verberibus publice castigatum faciat in exilium deportari, ut unius pena multorum possit esse correctio.

^m Cyprian. in Vita Cæsar. Arelatens. apud Surium die xxvii. Augusti, et in Histor. Flagell. p. 102.

ⁿ Conc. Agath. c. xxxviii. (Labbe. vol. iv. p. 1389.) Si verborum increpatio non emendaverit, etiam verberibus statuimus coerceri. — It. c. xli. Quem (clericum) ebrium fuisse constititerit, ut ordo patitur, aut triginta dierum spatio a communione stituimus submovendum, aut corporali subdendum supplicio.

^o Conc. Matiscon. I. c. viii. (Labbe. vol. v. p. 968.) Si junior fuerit, uno minus de quadraginta ictus accipiat.

^p Conc. Venet. c. vi.

^q Conc. Epao. c. xv. (Labbe. vol. iv. p. 1578.) Si superioris loci clericus hæretici-cujuscumque clerici convivio interfuerit, anni spatio pacem ecclesiæ non habebit. Quod juniores clerici si præsumserint, vapulabunt.

stripes, as the peculiar punishment of the minor clergy, for the same crimes that were punished with excommunication for a whole year in the superior clergy. Nor is this to be wondered at in these councils: since St. Austin assures us,^r “This kind of punishment, by stripes, was commonly used, not only by schoolmasters and parents, but by bishops in their consistories also.” And the plain reason of all this seems to be, not so much the distinction of crimes, as the distinction of age and quality in the persons.

SECT. XII. — *How Persons were sometimes excommunicated after Death.*

Another inquiry may be made concerning persons deceased, Whether ever any excommunication was inflicted on men after death, if they died in the peace and communion of the Church? It has already been observed,^s that when men died impenitent under the bonds of excommunication unrelaxed, a necessary consequence of that was the denying them Christian burial, and all future memorial in the prayers and oblations of the Church, by striking their names out of the diptychs, or holy books, which kept the memorial of such as died in the peace and communion of the Church. But the question here is not about those that died so excommunicate, but those that died in the visible communion and external peace of the Church, and under no ecclesiastical censure; whether upon any new discovery of their errors or crimes after death, they were liable to be excommunicated, and after what manner that censure was passed upon them. Now the resolution of this question, in part, will easily be given from a famous case in Cyprian, concerning one Geminus Victor; who, contrary to the rule of a council, had made Geminus Faustinus a guardian or trustee, by his last will and testament; for which transgression Cyprian, after

^r Aug. Epist. clix. ad Marcellin. (Bened. vol. ii. p. 300, F.) Noli perdere paternam diligentiam, quam in ipsa inquisitione servasti, quando tantorum scelerum confessionem, non extendente eculeo, non sulcantibus ungulis, sed virgarum verberibus eruisti. Qui modus coercitionis a magistris artium, &c. — Aug. Sermon. cccv. de Tempore. Si ad vos pertinent, etiam flagellis cœdente, &c.

^s Chap. ii. sect. xi.

his death, wrote to the Church of Furni, where he had lived, to put the sentence of the council in execution against him; telling them,^t "That since Victor had presumed, against the rule made in council, to appoint Geminus Faustinus, one of the presbyters of the Church, his trustee, for this offence no oblation ought to be made for his death, nor any prayer to be offered in his name in the church;" according to the custom of praying then for all that were departed in the faith. This was a plain excommunication of him after death, by erasing his name out of the diptychs of the Church. Such another decree we find in the African Code against any bishop that should make heretics or heathens his heirs, whether they were of his own kindred or not: "Let such a one be anathematized after death, and let not his name be written or recited among the priests of God." With this agrees what St. Austin says more than once concerning Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage,^w "That if the things which the Donatists objected against him were true, and they could evidently prove them, the Catholics were ready to anathematize him after death." And there want not, in fact, several instances of this practice: for thus Origen, as Socrates says,^x was excommunicated two hundred years after his death, by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria. And Theodorus of Mopsuestia was so anathematized by the fifth general council, as appears from Eva-

^t Cyprian. Epist. lxxvi. al. i. ad Cler. Furnitan. p. 3, (p. 170, edit. Fell. Amstel.) Ideo Victor, quum contra formam, nuper in concilio a sacerdotibus datam, Geminium Faustinum presbyterum ausus sit tutorem constituere, non est, quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in ecclesia frequentetur. (Oxon. 1682.)

^w Cod. Afric. lxxxi. (Labbe. vol. ii. p. 1098.) Μετὰ θάνατον ἀνάθημα τῷ τοιοῦτῳ ληγείη, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μηδαμῶς παρὰ τοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερῶσιν ἀνιχνεῖται.

^x Aug. Epist. i. ad Bonifac. Comitem, p. 80, (p. 208, edit. Basil. 1569.) Si vera essent, quæ a Donatistis objecta sunt Cæciliano, et nobis possent aliquando monstrari, ipsum jam mortuum anathematizaremus. — It. Ep. clii. quæ est epistola synodica Concilii Zertensis ad Donatistas. Si forte malus esset inventus, ipsum anathematizaremus. (Vol. ii. p. 347.)

^x Socrat. lib. vii. c. xlv. (Vales. p. 315, D.) Θαυμάσαι δὲ μοι ἔπιτι, πῶς ὁ φθόνος Ὁριγίνους μὴν τιλιωτήσαντος, ἤψατο, Ἰωάννου δὲ ἱφίστατο· ὁ μὲν γὰρ μετὰ διακόνια ἔτη πρὸ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τιλιωτῆς, ὑπὸ Θεοφίλου ἀποιωνήσας γέγονεν· Ἰωάννης δὲ, τριακοσῶν πέμπτῃ ἔτι μετὰ τὴν τιλιωτὴν εἰς κοινωνίαν ὑπὸ Πρέσβυτου ἰδίχθη.

grius,^a and the Letters of Justinian, and the Acts of the Council. In like manner, the sixth general Council^a anathematized Pope Honorius, as a Monothelite, after death, together with Cyrus, bishop of Alexandria, and Theodorus, bishop of Pharan, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, Petrus, and Paulus, bishops of Constantinople, all whose names were erased out of the sacred diptychs, after death, by the order of that council. It is a grand dispute, indeed, among the gentlemen of the Church of Rome, Whether the name of their Pope Honorius ought to stand in that black list? (Baronius^a affirming, that the Acts of the Council, where his name is inserted, are corrupted; and Cambefis,^b on the other hand, writing a whole volume against Baronius, to prove them genuine.) But however that matter be, there is no dispute about all the rest, but that they were certainly anathematized by that Council after death. Sometimes men were unjustly excommunicated, either living or dead: and then the way to restore them to the communion of the Church was, to insert their names into the diptychs, whence they had been expunged before. Thus Theodoret says,^c “Atticus restored the name of Chrysostom, after it had for many years been left out.” And John, bishop of Constantinople, in a synod (an. 518), restored the names of Pope Leo, and

^a Evagr. lib. iv. c. xxxviii. (Vales. p. 413, B.) Ἀναγνωσθεὶς ὁ πολλῶν ῥήσιον Θεοδώρου καὶ Θεοδορίου, διχθὲντος δὲ ὡς καὶ πάλαι Θεόδωρος πατικίκετο, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀπηλείψαι δέλτων, καὶ ὡς μετὰ θάνατον δίδω τοὺς αἰρετικούς κατακρίνισθαι Θεόδωρον μὴν ἀπάσαις τὸ δὲ λεγόμενον ἀναθιματίζουσι, κ. τ. λ. — Justin. Epist. in Act. i. Conc. V. General. (tom. v. Conc. p. 423.) Ex his omnibus cognoscetis, quod ab illo tempore condemnatis est tam ipse (Theodorus) quam blasphemiae ejus a sanctis patribus; et quod propter istas superioribus temporibus deletum est et nomen ejus a sacris diptychis ecclesiae, cujus fuit episcopus. Hortans autem etiam illud disceptare, quod vane profertur ab eis, qui dicunt, non oportere post mortem hæreticos anathematizari; et sequi in hoc doctrinam sanctorum patrum, qui non solum viventes hæreticos condempnaverunt, sed et post mortem, utpote in sua impietate mortuos anathematizaverunt, sicut eos, qui injuste condemnati sunt, revocaverunt post mortem, et in sacris diptychis scripserunt.

^a Conc. Constantin. VI. gen. act. xiii. (tom. vi. Conc. p. 939, seqq.)

^b Baron. an. 680, n. xxxiv. (n. xxxvi. tom. viii. edit. Antwerp. 1611.) — It. ad. an. 681, nn. xxii. xxvi. xxvii. ad. an. 682, nn. ix.—xii. cit. edit.

^c Cambefis. Histor. Monothelitar. Paris. 1648.

^c Theodoret. lib. v. c. xxxv. (Vales. p. 241, D.) Οὗτος τὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ πάνου προσηγορίου πρῶτος τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς διατύχους ἐνέταξε.

Euphemius, and Macedonius, and the Council of Chalcedon, which, by the fraud of Anastasius the emperor, who was an Eutychian heretic, had all been cast out of the diptychs of the Church.^d This was the method both of condemning and restoring men to the communion of the Church after death. To deny them Christian burial, or not to receive their oblations, or to erase their names out of the diptychs, was the same thing as to declare them anathematized, and cast out of the communion of the faithful, with whom the Church maintained communion after death. And so far we have considered the persons that might, or might not, be the subjects of ecclesiastical censures, whether living or dead.

SECT. XIII. — *The Censures of the Church not to be inflicted for small Offences.*

The next inquiry is, concerning the crimes for which these censures might be inflicted. And here the canons are wont to make a very exact and nice distinction, in general, between the greater and lesser sins, the former only being such as were regarded in the business of excommunication : for this being the severest of all punishments, was not to be inflicted for every trifle. “Therefore bishops,” says the Council of Agde,^e “must have a great regard to sacerdotal moderation, and not presume to excommunicate either the innocent, or those that are guilty only of small offences : otherwise they are liable to be admonished by the neighbouring bishops of the province ; and if they obey not, the bishops of the province are to refuse them their communion till the next synod.” Some copies read it, “They shall not

^d Acta Conc. Constantin. sub Menna, act. v. p. 164, c. d. p. 165, b. c. d. p. 172, b. c.

^e Conc. Agath. c. iii. (iv. 1383.) Episcopi, si sacerdotali moderatione postposita, innocentes, aut minimis causis culpabiles excommunicare præsumserint, et ad gratiam festinantes recipere fortasse noluerint, a vicinis episcopis cujuslibet provincie litteris moneantur : et si parere noluerint, communicatio illis usque ad tempus synodi a reliquis episcopis negetur, [al. Communicatio illis usque ad tempus synodi a reliquis episcopis non negetur.] — Gratian. caus. xi. quæst. iii. c. viii. ubi hic canon citatur, et correctores Romani hanc variam lectionem observant : *Denegetur*] ‘Sic habet Ivo, et Pannormia, et antiquiores conciliorum editiones, et duo Vaticana exemplaria : videturque huic simile, quod legitur, sup. 6, q. 2, c. fin. sed in recentioribus editionibus est, *non denegetur*.’

be denied communion till the next synod:" and then it refers to the persons excommunicated, "That though they were rashly cast out of the Church for slight causes by their own bishops, the rest of the bishops should not deny them communion, till their cause was heard in a synod." The fifth Council of Orleans has a like order,^f "That no bishop shall suspend any of the faithful from the communion for little and slight causes, but only for those crimes for which the ancient fathers command offenders to be cast out of the Church." And this is repeated in the Council of Arvern, or Clermont,^g held about the same time (an. 549).

SECT. XIV.—*What the Ancients meant by small Offences in this Matter, and how they distinguished them from the greater.*

But it may be asked, what the ancient fathers meant by slight causes and small offences, in this business of ecclesiastical censure? And how they distinguished these from those greater crimes, which made men liable to excommunication, and public penance in the Church? The right understanding of these things will be of great use, not only to give us a clear view of the nature of ecclesiastical discipline, but also to shew the vanity of a late distinction between mortal and venial sin, as used by the Romanists, to bring all sins that are mortal under the necessity of auricular confession, and private absolution. Now it is certain the ancients did not believe any sins to be venial, as that signifies needing no pardon, but, in that sense, all sins to be mortal in their own nature, and such as we have need to ask pardon for at the hands of God. But because there are some sins of human frailty and inadvertency in the best of men, and sins of daily incursion, without which no man lives; these they usually call venial sins, as needing no other repentance, but a general confession; nor any other pardon, but what is daily granted by God to good men, upon their daily prayers and

^f Conc. Aurel. V. c. ii. Nullus sacerdotum quemquam rectæ fidei hominem pro parvis et levibus causis a communione suspendat: Præter eas culpas, pro quibus antiqui patres arceri jusserunt committentes.

^g Conc. Avernens. II. c. ii. (tom. v. Conc. p. 402.)

acknowledgment of their offences. Besides these, there are other sins of wilfulness, and of a more malignant nature, which, if continued in, without a particular repentance and reformation, will prove mortal, and exclude men from the kingdom of heaven: and yet many of these were such as did not ordinarily bring men under the highest censures of the Church, but were to be cured only by general reproofs and exhortations to repentance. These also, in like manner, with respect to the severity of Church-discipline, which did not reach them, were sometimes termed lesser and venial sins, in opposition to those yet more heinous sins, which brought men under excommunication and public penance, to make expiation and atonement for them. These sins were mortal in their own nature, and fatal in the effect to the sinner: but yet the Church, for many reasons, was obliged sometimes to let them pass, without any other censure than a pastoral admonition. But there was a third sort of sins both of a malignant, and public, and flagrant nature, of which sinners might easily be impleaded and convicted: and these were those great sins (as they are usually termed, in opposition to both the forementioned kinds), on which the highest severities of Church-discipline were exercised, unless where the multitude of sinners, or their abettors, or the danger of schism (as has been noted before), made the thing impracticable and unfeasible. This threefold distinction of sins is accurately noted by St. Austin in his book of Faith and Works: he says,^h "There are some sins so great, as to deserve to be punished with excommunication, according to

^h Aug. de Fide et Operibus, c. xxvi. (tom. iv. opp. p. 82, ed. Basil. 1569.) (Bened. 1700, vol. vi. p. 140, F.) Nisi essent quedam ita gravia, ut etiam excommunicatione plectenda sint, non diceret apostolus, 'Congregatis vobis et meo Spiritu, tradere ejusmodi hominem Satanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit in die Domini Jesu.' Unde etiam dicit, 'Ne lugeam multos, qui ante peccaverunt, et non egerunt pœnitentiam super immunditiam et fornicationem, quam gesserunt.' Item, nisi essent quedam non ea humilitate pœnitentia sananda, qualis in ecclesia datur eis, qui proprie pœnitentes vocantur, sed quibusdam correptionem medicamentis, non diceret ipse Dominus, 'Corripe eum inter te et ipsum solum; et si te audierit, lucratus es fratrem tuum.' Postremo, nisi essent quedam, sine quibus hæc vita non agitur, non quotidianam medelam poneret in oratione quam docuit, ut dicamus, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.'

that of the apostle, to 'deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.'" Again, "There are other sins, which are not to be cured by that humiliation of penance, which is imposed upon those who are properly called penitents in the Church, but by certain medicines of reproof, according to that of our Lord, 'Tell him of his fault between him and thee alone; if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.'" Lastly, "There are other sins, for which he hath left us a daily cure in that prayer, wherein he hath taught us to say, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.'" By this it is plain, that all great and deadly sins did not bring men under the public censure of excommunication, but only those of the first kind, which were of the highest nature. In other places he distinguishes sins only into two kinds, greater and lesser; sins that obliged men to do public penance, and sins that were pardoned by daily prayer, weeping, fasting, giving, and forgiving, without any obligation to do public penance for them. The former he calls 'mortal sins,' and the other 'venial;' not because they were not mortal in their own nature, but because they were pardoned without the solemnity of a public repentance. So many great sins, such as anger, and evil thoughts, and evil speaking, and excess in the use of lawful things, are reckoned by him in the number of lesser sins, in comparison of such great and deadly sins, as murder, theft, and adultery. "He that is free," says he,ⁱ "from great and mortal sins, such as the crimes of murder, theft, and adultery, yet being liable to many lesser sins of the tongue, and

ⁱ Aug. Tract. xii. in Joan. p. 47, (tom. ix. opp. p. 112, edit. Basil.) (Bened. iii. p. 284, A. B.) Liberatus ab illis letalibus et grandibus peccatis, qualia sunt facinora, homicidia, furta, adulteria, propter illa, quæ minuta videntur esse peccata linguæ, aut cogitationum, aut immoderationis in rebus concessis, facit veritatem confessionis, et venit ad lucem in operibus bonis: quoniam minuta plura peccata, si negligantur, occidunt. Minutæ sunt guttæ, quæ flumina implent, minuta sunt grana arenæ: sed si multa arena imponatur, premit atque opprimit. Hoc facit sentina neglecta, quod facit fluctus irruens: paullatim per sentinam intrat, sed diu intrando et non exhauriendo, mergit navim. Quid est autem exhaurire, nisi bonis operibus agere, ut non obruant peccata, gemendo, jejunando, tribuendo, ignoscendo?

thoughts, and immoderate use of lawful things, he thereupon exercises himself in making true confession of them, and comes to the light by performing good works; because a multitude of lesser sins, if they be neglected, kill the soul. Many small drops fill a river; a grain of sand is but a small thing, but many grains added together will load and oppress us. The pump of a ship, if it be neglected, will do the same thing as a boisterous wave. It enters by little and little at the pump; but by long entering and never draining, at last it sinks the ship. And what is it to drain the soul, but by good works, such as mourning and fasting, and giving and forgiving, to take care that such sins do not overwhelm the soul?" The lesser sins he here speaks of, were not only sins of inadvertency and common human frailty, but sins of a higher nature: and yet he calls them little sins, in comparison of those great and deadly sins of adultery and murder, for which men underwent public penance, which they did not for these other sins; which yet would prove fatal, unless men took care, by confession, and godly sorrow, and fasting, and almsdeeds, and charity to their enemies, to clear themselves of them. In another place, he speaks of two sorts of repentance for two sorts of sins committed after baptism, which he thus distinguishes:^k "There is one sort of repentance which is to be performed every day. And whence can we shew that? I cannot better shew it, than from the daily prayer, where our Lord hath taught us to pray, and shewed us what we are to say unto the Father in these words, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' There is another more weighty and mournful sort of repentance, from which men are properly called penitents in the

^k Aug. Hom. xxvii. ex l. tom. x. p. 177, (pp. 480-482, edit. Basil.) (Vol. v. p. 954, F.) *Est alia pœnitentia quotidiana. Et ubi illam ostendimus? non habeo ubi melius ostendam, quam in Oratione quotidiana, ubi Dominus orare nos docuit, quid ad Patrem dicamus ostendit, et in his verbis posuit, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.'* . . . *Est pœnitentia gravior atque luctuosior, in qua proprie vocantur in ecclesiâ pœnitentes, remoti etiam a sacramento altaris participandi, ne accipiendo indigne iudicium sibi manducant et bibant. Illa ergo pœnitentia luctuosa est. Grave vulnus est: adulterium forte commissum est, forte homicidium, forte aliquod sacrilegium; gravis res, grave vulnus, letale, mortiferum: sed omnipotens medicus.*

Church: by which they are sequestered from partaking of the sacrament of the altar, lest they should eat and drink damnation to themselves. This is a grievous repentance, the wound is very grievous, perhaps adultery, or murder, or sacrilege, has been committed. This is a grievous thing, a grievous wound, mortal and deadly, but the physician is Almighty." Here, again, is a plain distinction between such great sins as adultery, sacrilege, and murder, for which men were to do a long and public penance in the Church; and such sins of a lower rank as were to be done away by daily prayer and daily repentance, which was the remedy for all sins, great and small, that were not of the highest nature. Upon this account he calls public penance by the name of *pœnitentia major*, 'the greater repentance,' for great and deadly sins, in opposition to the lesser, or daily, repentance for sins of a lower nature, which he terms venial sins, because they were more easily pardoned by that ordinary and daily repentance. Thus in his instructions to the catechumens, directing them how to lead their lives after baptism, he tells them,¹ "He did not prescribe them an impossible rule, to live here altogether free from sin: for there were some lesser or more pardonable sins, without which this life is not passed by any. Baptism was appointed for the remission of all sins, of what kind soever: but for lesser sins prayer was appointed. And what says the prayer? 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' We are once washed, or cleansed from sin by baptism, we are daily cleansed by prayer. Only do not commit such things for which it will be necessary to separate you from the body of Christ: which

¹ Aug. de Symbolo, ad Catechumenos, lib. i. c. vii. (tom. ix. p. 1101, edit. Basil.) (Bened. vi. p. 404, F.) Non vobis dico, quia sine peccato heic vivetis: sed sunt venialia, sine quibus vita ista non est. Propter omnia peccata baptismus inventus est: propter levia, sine quibus esse non possumus, oratio inventa. Quid habet oratio? 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.' Semel abluimur baptisate; quotidie abluimur oratione. Sed nolite illa committere, pro quibus necesse est, ut a Christi corpore separemini; quod absit a vobis. Illi enim, quos videtis agere pœnitentiam, scelera commiserunt, aut adulteria, aut aliqua facta immania: inde agunt pœnitentiam. Nam si levia peccata eorum essent, ad hæc quotidiana oratio delenda sufficeret. Ergo tribus modis dimittuntur peccata in ecclesia, in baptisate, in oratione, in humilitate major-e, -is pœnitentiæ.

God forbid. For they whom you see doing penance, have committed great crimes, either adultery, or some such heinous wickedness, upon account of which they are doing penance. For if they had been light sins, the daily prayer would have been sufficient to blot them out. Therefore there are three ways by which sins are forgiven in the Church, by baptism, by prayer, and by the humiliation of the greater repentance." Where, by the 'greater repentance,' it is evident he means the public penance done in the Church for crimes only of the highest nature; and therefore the 'lesser repentance,' accompanying men's daily prayers, was sufficient to blot out both lesser sins of daily incursion, and also greater sins, for which no public penance was required, but only the sincere reformation of the sinner, producing good works, and especially works of charity and mercy. Thus, in his *Enchiridion*,^m "For daily, short, and light sins, without which no man lives, the daily prayer of the faithful is sufficient. This prayer blots out all little and daily sins. It blots out also those sins with which the life of the faithful is more egregiously defiled, provided they change it into better by true repentance; if they say truly, with actions corresponding to their words, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' " He often distinguishes between *peccatum* and *crimen*,ⁿ making the

^m Aug. *Enchirid.* c. lxxi. (Bened. vol. vi. p. 163, E.) De quotidianis, brevibus, levibusque peccatis, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana oratio fidelium satisfacit. . . . Delet omnino hæc oratio minima et quotidiana peccata. Delet et illa, a quibus vita fidelium etiam scelerate gesta, sed pœnitendo in melius mutata discedit: si quemadmodum veraciter dicitur, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra,' quoniam non desunt, quæ dimittantur; ita veraciter dicatur, 'sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.'

ⁿ Ibid. Hom. xli. ex l. (vol. v. p. 1056.) Homo baptizatus, si vitam, non audeo dicere sine peccato (quis enim sine peccato?) sed vitam sine crimine duxerit, et talia habuerit peccata, quæ quotidie dimittuntur in Oratione dicente, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra,' &c. quando diem finierit, vitam non finit, sed transit de vita in vitam. — Id. *Tractat.* xli. in Joan. tom. ix. p. 126. Apostolus, quando elegit ordinandos, . . . non ait, 'Si quis sine peccato est;' hoc enim si diceret, omnis homo reprobareretur, nullus ordinaretur: sed ait, 'Si quis sine crimine est,' sicut est homicidium, adulterium, aliqua immunditia fornicationis, furtum, fraus, sacrilegium, et cetera hujusmodi. (Bened. vol. iii. p. 417, C.)—Paulo ante: Crimen est peccatum grave, accusatione et damnatione dignissimum. — De Civit. lib. xxi. c. xxvii. (vol. vii. p. 492, F.) Non putare nos esse sine peccatis, etiamsi a criminibus essemus immunes.

first to be such sins as are forgiven by daily prayer and daily repentance; and the second such flagrant crimes as murder, adultery, fornication, theft, fraud, sacrilege, and suchlike, for which men were obliged to undergo public penance in the Church. And he understands the same things, when he so often distinguishes between greater and lesser sins,^o mortal sins and venial sins; prescribing public repentance for the one, and private repentance for the other. By all which it is manifest, that neither sins of human frailty and daily incursion, to which the best of men are liable; nor many sins of a more malignant nature; as many evil words, and evil thoughts, and excesses in the use of lawful things, and hasty anger, and frequent going to law for trifles, were reckoned into the number of those flagrant crimes, for which the severities of Church-discipline were inflicted on delinquents: but all such sins, being of an inferior nature, or not so easy to be proved upon men, were only matters of reproof, and left to their own consciences to cure, either by daily prayer, or private repentance and reformation.

And that this was so from the beginning, appears from what the learned Du Pin has discoursed upon this matter^p against Mr. Arnaud, and others of his own communion. He observes, that all the ancients made this very distinction between great and little sins, and reckoned only very capital and mortal crimes in the number of such sins, as were to be punished with excommunication. Tertullian, even when he disputes against the Church upon the point of absolution and re-admission of excommunicated sinners into the Church again, owns, notwithstanding, that there were many sins which did not bring men under the censure of excommuni-

^o Aug. Tractat. xxvi. in Joan. p. 93, (p. 227, lin. ult. edit. Basil. 1569.) Peccata et si sint quotidiana, vel non sint mortifera, antequam ad altare accedatis, attendite, quod dicatis. — De Symbol. lib. i. c. vii. c. cit. sub litt. anteced. (!). — Id. cont. Julian. Pelag. lib. ii. c. x.

^p Du Pin, Bibl. Cent. iv. p. 218, (tom. ii. p. 275, a. edit. Gallic. 1690.) Il est bon de faire remarque en passant, comment les pères entendent cette distinction de grands et de petits péchés. Tertullien, qui est le premier, qui en parle clairement dans son livre de la pudicité, met au nombre des petits péchés la colère, la médisance, une serment inutile, un manque de parole, un mensonge fait par honte ou par nécessité, &c. Usque ad p. 276, sub finem.

cation, because they were sins of daily incursion, to which all men were more or less exposed. Among these^a he reckons anger, when it is unjust either in its cause or duration, when the sun goes down upon our wrath; and also quarrelling and evil speaking, a rash or vain oath, a failure in our promise; a lie, extorted by modesty or necessity; and many such temptations which befall men in their business and offices, in gain, in eating, and seeing, and hearing. On the contrary, there are some more grievous and deadly sins, which are incapable of pardon (according to his rigid principles of Montanism), such as murder, idolatry, fraud, apostasy, blasphemy, adultery, and fornication, and other such defilements of the temple of God. In his book against Marcion, he precisely reckons up seven sins, which he distinguishes by the names of capital crimes,^r—idolatry, blasphemy, murder, adultery, fornication, false witness, and fraud. The Roman clergy observe the same distinction between greater and lesser sins, when they, in their epistle^s to Cyprian, style idolatry the great sin, and the grand sin above all others. And Cyprian^t himself calls it *summum delictum*, ‘the highest of all crimes,’ the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which has never forgiveness, but makes a man guilty of eternal sin; that is, a sin that was to be punished in both worlds, without repentance. Which is the notion that most of the ancients had of the sin against the

^a Tertul. de Pudicit. c. xix. (Paris. 1664, p. 582, B.) Cui enim non accidit aut irasci inique et ultra solis occasum; aut et manum immittere, aut facile maledicere, aut temere jurare, aut fidem pacti destruere; aut verecundia aut necessitate mentiri? in negotiis, in officiis, in quæstu, in victu, in visu, in auditu, quanta tentamur, ut, si nulla sit venia istorum, nemini salus competat. . . . Sunt autem et contraria istis, ut graviora et exitiosa, quæ veniam non capiant, homicidium, idololatria, fraus, negatio, blasphemia, utique et mœchia et fornicatio, et si qua alia violatio templi Dei.

^r Ibid. cont. Marcion. lib. iv. c. ix. (p. 419, D.) Capitalia delicta vocat, idololatriam, blasphemiam, homicidium, adulterium, stuprum, falsum testimonium, fraudem.

^s Ap. Cyprian. Ep. xxvi. al. xxxi. (Oxon. 1682, p. 63), (p. 214, edit. Fell. Amstelod.) Grande delictum et ingens supra omnia peccatum.

^t Cyprian. Ep. x. al. xvi. (p. 36, Oxon. 1682), (p. 195, edit. Amstelod.) Summum delictum esse, quod persecutio committi cœgit, sciunt ipsi etiam, qui commiserunt, quum dixerit Dominus, qui blasphemaverit Spiritum Sanctum, non habebit remissam, sed reus est æterni peccati.

Holy Ghost (to note this by the way); not that it was absolutely unpardonable,^u but that men were to be punished for it both in this world and the next, unless they truly repented of it. Again, Cyprian speaking of idolatry in those that lapsed in persecution, he^v distinguishes it by the title of the 'most heinous and extreme offence.' And speaking also of adultery, fraud, and murder, he calls them^w mortal sins, by way of distinction from those of a lower kind. So Origen calls some great and mortal sins, such as blasphemy, for which the Church^x very rarely allowed men to do penance above once: but there are other common sins of daily incursion, such as evil words, and other corruptions of good manners, which admit of frequent repentance, and are redeemed continually without intermission. Where he plainly shews, that the repentance which the Church allowed but once for great sins, means public penance in the church; but lesser and common offences were atoned for another way, and as often as they were committed, by a daily repentance. In another^y place he reckons up lesser sins, to which all are more or less subject, such as detraction and mutual defamation of one another, self-conceit, banqueting, lying, idle words, and such other light faults, as are frequently found in men who have made a good proficiency in the Church. These, therefore, could not be the sins which ordinarily

^u See chap. vii. sect. iii.

^v Cyprian. Epist. xi. al. xv. ad Martyr. p. 34, (p. 193, edit. Amstelod.) Ante actam pœnitentiam, ante exomologesin gravissimi atque extremi delicti factam, &c.

^w Ibid. de Patient. (p. 148, lin. vit. edit. cit.) Adulterium, fraus, homicidium mortale crimen est. (Oxon. 1682, p. 216.)

^x Origen. Hom. xv. in Levitic. tom. i. p. 174, (p. 109, c. edit. Paris. 1604.) Si nos aliqua culpa moralis [alii rectius legunt, *mortalis*] invenerit, quæ non in crimine mortali, non in blasphemia fidei, . . . sed vel in sermonis, vel in morum vitio consistat, . . . hujusmodi culpa semper reparari potest, nec aliquando tibi interdicitur de commissis hujusmodi pœnitudinem agere. In gravioribus enim criminibus semel tantum [vel raro], pœnitentiæ conceditur locus: ista vero communia, quæ frequenter incurrimus, semper pœnitentiam recipiunt, et sine intermissione redimuntur. (Paris. 1733, vol. ii. p. 262.)

^y Ibid. Tract. vi. in Matth. p. 60, (p. 38, m. edit. Paris.) Nec enim existimo, cito aliquem inveniri in ecclesia, qui non jam ter in eadem culpa argutus sit, utputa in detractatione, qua invicem homines detrahunt proximis suis, aut inflatione, aut in epulatione, aut in verbo mendacii vel otioso, aut in tali aliqua culpa levi, quæ etiam in illis, qui videntur proficere in ecclesia, frequenter inveniuntur.

subjected men to excommunication, unless we could suppose all men liable to so severe a censure. But there were other crimes, which he calls great sins, and sins unto death: such as adultery, murder, effeminacy, and defilement with mankind, which whoever committed, he was to be treated as a heathen man or a publican. St. Ambrose makes the same distinction of sins: "As there is but one baptism, so there is but one public penance: for we are to do penance for the sins we commit every day; but this last penance is for small sins, and the former for great ones." And so Prosper, or Julianus Pomerius, under his name, says, "There are some sins so small, that we cannot perfectly avoid them; and for the expiation of these we cry daily to God, and say, 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' But there are other sins which ought more carefully to be avoided, because when men are publicly convicted of them, they make them liable to be punished by human judgment;" meaning, that such capital offences were the crimes which subjected men to excommunication, and not those lesser faults, which were only matter of daily repentance. Cassian observes seven kinds of human failings, which he distinguishes from mortal sins, saying, "It is one thing to commit mortal sin, and another to be overtaken with an evil thought, or to offend by ignorance, or forgetfulness, or an

* Ambros. de Pœnitent. lib. ii. c. x. (Paris. 1836, vol. iv. p. 117.) Sicut unum baptismus, ita una pœnitentia, quæ tamen publice agitur; nam quotidiani nos debet pœnitere peccati: sed hæc delictorum leviorum, illa graviorum.

* Prosper. de Vit. Contemplat. lib. ii. c. vii. Exceptis peccatis, quæ tam parva sunt, ut caveri non possint, pro quibus expiandis quotidie clamamus ad Deum, et dicimus, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris,' illa crimina caveantur, quæ publicata suos auctores humano faciunt damnari judicio. (Bassan. 1782, vol. ii. p. 20.)

† Cassian. Collat. xxii. c. xiii. (Paris. 1609, p. 586.) Aliud est, admittere mortale peccatum, et aliud est cogitatione, quæ peccato non caret, præveniri; vel ignorantæ, aut oblivionis errore, aut facilitate otiosi sermonis offendere, aut ad punctum in fidei theoria aliquid hæsitare, aut subtili quadam *πυροδότημα* titillatione pulsari, aut necessitate naturæ aliquantisper a summa perfectione recedere. Hæc enim sunt septem lapsuum genera, in quibus sanctus licet nonnumquam cadat, tamen justus esse non desinit; quæ quamvis levia esse videantur ac parva, tamen faciunt eum sine peccato esse non posse. Habet enim, pro quibus quotidianam gerens penitundinem, et veniam veraciter debeat postulare, et pro suis indesinenter orare peccatis, dicens, 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra.'

idle word, which easily slips from us ; or by a short hesitation in some point of faith, or the subtle ticklings of vain-glory, or by necessity of nature to fall short of perfection. For these seven ways a holy man is liable to fall, and yet he does not cease to be righteous ; and though they seem to be but small sins, yet they are enough to prove that he cannot be without sin : for he has, upon this account, need of a daily repentance, and is obliged in truth, without any dissimulation, to ask pardon, and pray continually for his sins, saying, ‘ Forgive us our trespasses.’ ” Gregory Nyssen has a canonical epistle concerning discipline, wherein, as Du Pin observes,^c “ He makes an exact enumeration of those sins which subjected men to public penance : which are all enormous sins and considerable crimes,” such as idolatry, apostasy, divination, murder, adultery, theft, and sacrilege. From all which it is very evident, that by the ancient rules no crimes were to be punished with excommunication, but those that were of the highest nature, which they called mortal sins ; nor yet all remote violations of the moral law, but only the more immediate, direct, and professed transgressions of it. “ Of the species and effects of anger,” as Gregory Nyssen observes,^d “ they inflicted canonical and public penance upon murder, but not upon all the inferior degrees of it : such as stripes, and evil speaking, or other effects of anger, which are prohibited in Scripture, and bring men in danger of eternal death. So of all the degrees of covetousness, which are very many and heinous, they punished none with excommunication, but only notorious oppression, and theft, and robbing of graves, and sacrilege, and the like. So that when they sometimes call sins of this middle rank light and venial sins, in contradistinction to those they termed mortal, they do not mean what now the vulgar casuists of the Romish Church mean by venial sins, but only that they were not of the number of those capital crimes for which the Church subjected men to excommuni-

^c Du Pin. l. c. p. 276. Ceci peut être confirmé par la lettre canonique de Saint Grégoire de Nysse à Letoïus, où il fait un dénombrement exact des péchés soumis à la pénitence publique, qui sont tous péchés énormes, et crimes considérables.

^d Nyssen. Epist. ad Letoïus, tot. (Paris. 1615, vol. i. p. 946.)

cation, and enjoined them to public repentance. Which the learned reader may find not only accurately demonstrated by Mr. Daillé,^e but ingenuously confessed by Du Pin,^f and also Petavius^g before him. Daillé transcribes Petavius's words, and I shall here transcribe those of Du Pin: "I would not have it thought," says he, "that I make these remarks to authorize licentiousness, or to insinuate that there are some mortal sins that may pass for venial. God forbid that I should have so detestable a design! On the contrary, my intention is to create a horror of all sins; first, of great crimes; secondly, of sins which may be mortal, though they appear not so enormous; and, thirdly, even of slighter sins also. But I thought myself obliged to observe here, for explaining a passage in St. Ambrose, 'That none but the sins of the first class did subject men to public penance, and that it is of these only the fathers speak, and which they comprehend under the name of enormous sins and crimes; though there be others which may be also

^e Dall. de Confess. Auricul. lib. iv. c. xx.

^f Du Pin. cent. iv. p. 219, (p. 276, edit. cit. Gallic.) Qu'on ne croie pas, que je fasse ces remarques, pour autoriser le relâchement, ou pour insinuer qu'il y a des péchés mortels, qui peuvent passer pour veniels : à Dieu ne plaise, que j'aie une si détestable intention ! au contraire, mon but est de donner de l'horreur de tous les péchés. Premièrement, des grands crimes ; secondement, des péchés qui peuvent être mortels, quoi qu'ils ne paroissent pas si énormes ; et troisièmement, des péchés même les plus légers. Mai j'ai crû, que j'étois obligé de remarquer ici, pour expliquer le passage de Saint Ambroise, qu'il n'y avoit que les péchés de la première classe, qui fussent soumis à la pénitence publique, et que c'est de ceux-là seulement que les pères parlent, et qu'ils comprennent sous le nom de péchés énormes et de crimes ; quoi qu'il y en ait d'autres, qui peuvent aussi être mortels, qu'un Chrétien doit soigneusement éviter, mais pour lesquels il n'étoit pas soumis à l'humiliation de la pénitence publique, mais seulement à des corrections et à des réprimandes faites en secret, comme Saint Augustin nous l'enseigne.

^g Petav. Not. in Epiphan. Principio peccatorum apud antiquos invenio genera fuisse duo. Alia mortalia sive capitalia dicebantur : non ut nos intelligere vulgo solemus, quæcumque Dei nos gratia ac spiritalibus caritatis ornamentis spoliant, sed hujus generis certa duntaxat, quæ cum graviora ceteris essent, tum canonibus ac synodorum decretis nominatim expressa : hæc, inquam, capitalia nominabant, quibus penæ a canonibus sigillatim proposita, &c. Alia vero leviora, et quotidiana dicebantur ; sive quæ nos venialia nuncupamus, sive alioqui mortalia, sed de quibus nulla nominatim extaret in conciliorum decretis mentio ; quale verbis gratia esse potest asperius in quemquam maledictum, aut convicium, perjurium, aliaque sexcenta ; quæ quamquam letalia sint, nullæ tamen iis a canonibus erant penæ constitutæ. (Paris. 1622, vol. ii. p. 238.)

mortal, and which a Christian ought carefully to shun ; but then they are such for which he was never subjected to the humiliation of a public penance, but only to corrections and reprimands, given in secret, as St. Austin informs us.' ” These observations are very just : for, it is certain, the fathers speak against all sins, even those of the lowest rank, as dangerous and mortal, if neglected and wilfully indulged, and not carefully opposed by striving against them, and washing away the guilt by daily repentance : according to what we have heard St. Austin say before,^b “ That a multitude of lesser sins overwhelm and kill the soul, if they be neglected ; as a small leak in a ship, if it be not carefully stopped or drained, will sink it, as well as a bigger wave : ” which comparisonⁱ he uses in many places. And the reader that pleases, may find the same caution given against lesser sins, as mortal in their own nature, if neglected and indulged, by Nazianzen,^j Basil,^k

^b Aug. Tract. xii. in Joan. p. 47. See before, note (l), p. 557.

ⁱ Ibid. Tract. i. in 1 Joan. p. 237, (p. 580, edit. Basil.) (Bened. vol. iii. p. 605, B.) Non potest homo, quam diu carnem portat, nisi habere vel levia peccata. Sed ista levia quæ dicimus, noli contemnere. Si contemnis quando appendis ; expavesce quando numeras. Levìa multa faciunt unum grande. Multæ guttæ implent flumen : multa grana faciunt massam. — Id. Serm. iii. in Psalm. cxviii. p. 545, (p. 1329, edit. cit.) (ibid. vol. iv. p. 962, F.) Quando adversus majora vigilantibus ; quædam incautis minuta subrepunt, quæ si adversus nos colligantur, etsi non singula suis molibus conterunt, omnia tamen acervo nos obruunt. — Id. Ep. cviii. (p. 507, edit. cit.) (ibid. 1700, vol. ii. p. 681, C.) Neque enim ea nobis dimitti volumus, quæ dimissa non dubitamus in baptismo ; sed illa utique, quæ humanæ fragilitati, quamvis parva, tamen crebra subrepunt : quæ si collecta contra nos fuerint, ita nos gravabunt, sicut unum aliquod grande peccatum. Quid enim interest ad naufragium, utrum uno grandi fluctu navis operiatur et obruatur, an paullatim subrepens aqua in sentinam et per negligentiam derelicta atque contempta impleat navem atque submergat ? — Id. Homil. ultum. ex l. (p. 556, tom. x. opp.) Quæ (peccata) quamvis singula non letali vulnere ferire sentiantur, sicuti homicidium, et adulterium, vel cetera hujusmodi ; tamen omnia simul congregata velut scabies, quo plura sunt, necant, aut nostrum decus ita exterminant, ut ab illius sponsi speciosi forma præ filiis hominum castissimis amplexibus separent, nisi medicamento quotidianæ pœnitentiæ desiccentur. (Bened. v. 945, C.)

^j Nazianz. Orat. xxxi. (vol. i. p. 504, A.) Τὸ κατὰ μέρος ὑφιπόμενον καὶ κλιπτόμενον, ἀνικαίσθητον μὲν τὴν πρὸς τὸ πάρον ἔχου βλάβην, εἰς τὸ κεφάλαιον δὲ τῆς κακίας ἀπαντᾷ.

^k Basil. Regul. Brevic. iv. Ἐρώτησις. Ἐάν τις καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ἁμαρτήματα στυγοῦσιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, λίγων, ὅτι ὀφείλῃσι μετανοῆσαι, μὴ ποτε καὶ αὐτοὺς ἁσπλαχνίης ἴσται, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καταλύει ; Ἀπόκρισις. Τοῦ Κυρίου διαβεβαιωσαμένου μὲν, ὅτι ἴσται ἱ, ἢ μία πικρία οὐ μὴ παρίδῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ὥς ἂν πάντα

Jerom,¹ Gregory the Great,^m and many others, who say there is no sin so small, but that in rigour of justice it would prove mortal, if God would enter into judgment with us, and be extreme to mark what is done amiss against his law, and especially in contempt of it. But to return to the business in hand.

SECT. XV.—*Excommunication not inflicted for temporal Causes.*

As it was a general rule not to use excommunication for slight offences, so we may observe, it was no rule to use this weapon, as in after ages, for mere pecuniary matters and temporal causes. It has frequently been complained of by learned men, both of the Protestant and Roman communion, that this is a great abuseⁿ of excommunication, that it is

γίνεσθαι ἀποθησαμίον δι, ὅτι πᾶν ῥῆμα ἄργον, ὃ ἰὰν λαλήσωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀποδίδωσιν· περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον ἡμῖς κρείσσον· αὐτοῖς δὲ καταφρονεῖν ὡς μικροῦ.

¹ Hieron. Ep. xiv. (p. 113, c. edit. Paris. 1643,) (Venet. vol. i. p. 1098, E.) Etsi multum inter peccata distare credimus, quia et legimus: tamen satis prodesse ad cautionem dicimus, etiam minima pro maximis cavere. Tanto enim facilius abstinemus a quocumque delicto, quanto illud magis metuimus. Nec cito ad majora progreditur, qui etiam parva formidat. Et sane nescio, an possimus leve aliquid peccatum dicere, quod in Dei contemptum admittitur, &c.

^m Gregor. lib. ii. in c. i. Reg. (tom. iii. part. ii. p. 59, e. edit. Paris. 1705.) Quia sine peccato electi etiam viri esse non possunt, quid restat, nisi ut a peccatis, quibus eos humana fragilitas maculare non desinit, evacuari quotidie conentur? Nam qui quotidie non exhaurit quod delinquit, etsi minima sunt peccata quæ congerit, paullatim anima repletur, atque ei merito auferunt fructum internæ saturitatis. — Id. lib. i. Hom. ii. in Ezech. (p. 1185, c. cit. edit.) Omne peccatum grave est, quia non permittit animam ad sublimia levare.

ⁿ Taylor Duct. Dubit. book iii. chap. iv. p. 617. In the Church of Rome, it hath been very usual to use excommunications for the discovery of thefts, or the manifestation of secret actions. Divers examples of which are in the Decretals and later canons of the Church. — Du Moulin, Buckler of Faith, p. 369. — Gentillet. Exam. Conc. Trident. p. 300, (p. 296, edit. Genev. 1586.) Secundo ejusdem tertii decreti capite, potestas datur episcopis decernendorum monitoriorum et excommunicationum; ut, a quibus res amissæ aut subtractæ possideantur, constare possit. Quod veteribus canonibus repugnat, qui non ob leves causas, sed ob graves tantum excommunicationis gladio spirituali utendum esse sanciunt, &c. — Gerson. de Vita Spirit. Anim. Lect. iv. Coroll. v. See following note (r). — Id. Sermon in Conc. Rhemens. part. ii. consider. ii. provisio ii. (tom. ii. opp. p. 552, edit. Antwerp. 1706.) Fiat insuper abbreviatio tam dispendiosarum litium, moderatio tot excommunicationem, tam a jure, quam ab homine fulminatorum. Et hoc nonnumquam pro defendenda, seu recuperanda re modica, parum utili, vel profana; quum tamen baculus iste primitus fuerit institutus a Christo tamquam durissimum, summumque supplicium,

often issued forth for the discovery of theft, or the manifestation of secret actions: of which there are divers instances in the Decretals; and approbation is given to them by the Council of Trent,^o only reserving such cases as a special privilege to the bishop, who is to give a premonition to he knows not whom, and condemn a pretended criminal without hearing, contrary to all the rules aforesaid in the Primitive Church; which allowed no excommunication in a slight cause, nor in any cause without sufficient evidence, and allowing the criminal to speak for himself. So, again, as Du Moulin observes out of Cardinal Tolet,^p “ In the Romish Church they excommunicate men for future time, and before any crime is committed; and that for securing only the stocks or trees of the lord of a town or village from spoil, although no man has laid hands upon them. At the request of a creditor they excommunicate a debtor, if he pay not within a certain time; and his insufficiency to pay is the only remedy, in the utmost extremity, which the law of the Decretals^a allows him from so severe a censure.” But that

quo nolentes ecclesiam audire plecti deberent. . . . Nunc apud quosdam talis regnat stoliditas, qualis apud illum, qui, ut muscam abigeret a fronte proximi, ictu securis excerebravit eum. Itaque temporalis incommoditas vix reputari debet musca pungens, per respectum ad æternam salutem, quam auferunt aliquando percussiones istæ per excommunicationes gravissimas, quæ ut in aliquem ceciderint, vix abjici possint, trahentibus de una in aliam, lupis curiæ rapacibus.

^o Conc. Trident. Sess. xxv. de Reformat. c. iii. Excommunicationes illæ, quæ monitionibus præmissis, ad finem revelationis, ut aiunt, aut pro deperditis seu subtractis rebus ferri solent, a nemine prorsus præterquam ab episcopo decernantur.

^p Du Moulin. *ibid.* ex Tolet. *Instruct. Sacerdot.* lib. i. c. viii. Toletus hæc habet: ‘ Quando fulminatur in futurum, quia vel præcipitur aliquid faciendum, vel prohibetur ne fiat, tunc, dummodo justum sit, quod præcipitur, resque sit gravis, potest excommunicatio ferri in transgressores: quia, qui non obedit, jam sit contumax et inobediens, et mortaliter peccat, et ideo excommunicationem contrahit.’

^a Decretal. Gregor. lib. iii. tit. xxiii. de Solut. c. iii. Odoardus clericus proposuit, quod quum P. clericus, D. laicus, et quidam alii ipsum coram officiali archi-diaconi Remensis super quibusdam debitis convenissent; idem in eum recognoscentem hujusmodi debita, sed propter rerum inopiam solvere non valentem, excommunicationis sententiam promulgavit. . . . Mandamus, quatenus si constiterit, quod prædictus O. in totum vel pro parte non possit solvere debita supra dicta, sententiam ipsam sine difficultate qualibet relaxetis, recepta prius ab ipso idonea cautione, ut si ad pinguorem fortunam devenerit, debita prædicta persolvat. (Labbe. xi. p. 391.)

which is chiefly complained of by their own learned Gerson, in this matter, is the abuse of excommunication in the pecuniary concerns of ecclesiastical courts themselves. Bishop Taylor has alleged him in these words :^r “ Not every contumacy against the orders of courts ecclesiastical is to be punished with this death. If it be in matters of faith or manners, then the case is competent : but when it is a question of money and fees, besides that the case is full of envy and reproach, apt for scandal, and to bring contempt upon the Church, the Church has no direct power in it ; and if it have by the aid of the civil power, then for that a civil coercion must be used. It is certainly unlawful to excommunicate any man for not paying the fees of courts. For a contumacy, there is an offence against the civil power, and he hath a sword of his own to avenge that ; but excommunication is a sword to avenge the contumacy of them who stubbornly offend against the discipline of the Church, in that wherein Christ hath given her authority, and that is in the matters of salvation and damnation immediate, in such things where there is no secular interest, where there can be no dispute, where the offender does not sin by consequence and interpretation, but directly, and without excuse. But let it be considered how great a reproach it is to ecclesiastical discipline, if it be made to minister to the covetousness or to the needs of proctors and advocates : and if the Church shall punish more cruelly than civil courts for equal offences, and because she hath but one thing to strike withal, if she upon all occasions smites with her sword, it will either kill too many, or hurt and affright none at all.” Whatever force there is in these arguments, or however they may affect the Romish Church for this apparent corruption of discipline, they do not in the least affect the Primitive Church,

^r Gers. de Vita Spiritual. lect. iv. corol. vii. (tom. iii. part. i. p. 42, cit. edit. Paris.) Sola itaque contumacia vera vel præsumpta, renuens stare judicio ecclesiæ, reddit hominem pro Christiano se gerentem dignum excommunicatione. . . . Porro differt plurimum, qualis est contumacia et quam damnosa ecclesiæ, pro qua materia et circa quam incurritur : nam pejor est contumacia in materia fidei et religionis, quam pusillæ quæstionis de paucis denariis, ubi nunquam tantum prodest obedientia, quantum obest excommunicatio separativa a spiritalibus suffragiis et societate sanctorum, &c. (Antwerp. 1706, vol. iii. p. 42.)

which was conscious of no such practice, but forbade all excommunication for light offences, among which pecuniary matters must be reckoned. It is true, bishops sometimes sat judges in civil causes, and their determinations in such cases were peremptory and final: but, then, their coercive power in such judicatures was not excommunication, but civil punishments, borrowed from the state, and which the state obliged itself to see duly put in execution; of which I have given an ample account^a heretofore, and shewed it to be a very different thing from excommunication, or any kind of ecclesiastical censure.

SECT. XVI. — *No Bishop allowed to use it to avenge any private Injury done to himself.*

I observe further, as very remarkable in this matter, that no bishop was allowed to excommunicate any man for any private injury done to himself: for though this might be a great crime, yet it looked like avenging himself, and therefore it was thought unbecoming his character to right himself by excommunication: but either he was to bear the injury patiently, or commit his cause to the judgment of others. Upon this account Cyprian distinguishes between injuries done to himself in his personal and private capacity, and injuries done to the detriment of the brethren, or whole body of the Church. “I can bear and pass over^t any affront that is put upon my episcopal character, as I have always done, when it only concerned my own person: but now there is no longer room for forbearance, when many of our brethren are deceived by some of you, who, whilst they would more plausibly recommend themselves to the lapsers by an unreasonable and hasty restoring them to the peace of the Church, do more really prejudice their salvation.” Here he plainly distinguishes between personal injuries, which he

^a Book ii. chap. vii.

^t Cyprian. Epist. x. al. xvi. ad Cler. (p. 36, Oxon. 1682), (p. 194, edit. Amstelod.) Contumeliam, episcopatus nostri dissimulare et ferre possum, sicut dissimulavi semper et pertuli: sed dissimulandi nunc locus non est: quando decipiatur fraternitas nostra a quibusdam vestrum, qui dum sine ratione restituendæ salutis plausibiles esse cupiunt, magis lapsis obsunt.

could bear without any great resentment, or thoughts of punishing: but those that were of a more public nature, and not only affronts to his authority, but prejudicial to the people, those he threatens to animadvert upon, according to their deserving. We find a like distinction made by Gregory the Great, who writing to a certain bishop who had excommunicated a man for a private injury done to himself, he thus reproves him for it: "You shew that you think nothing of heavenly things, whilst you inflict the curse of *anathema*, or 'excommunication,' for the avenging a private injury done to yourself, which the holy canons forbid. Therefore, be circumspect and cautious for the future, and presume not to do any such thing to any man in defence of your own private injuries. Otherwise you may expect to feel the censures of the Church for your presumption." That there were ancient canons to this purpose in the time of Gregory, cannot be doubted from his testimony, though I know of none at present that speak directly to this particular case: only in general the Council of Sardica forbids bishops to excommunicate any one in passion or hasty anger; and allows the injured person to appeal to the provincial synod, or the neighbouring bishops, for redress in all such cases.

Gregor. lib. ii. ep. xxxiv. Nihil te ostendis de cœlestibus cogitare, sed terrenam te conversationem habere significas; dum pro vindicta propriæ injuriæ (quod sacris regulis prohibetur) maledictionem anathematis invexit. Unde de cetero omnino esto circumspectus atque sollicitus, et talia cuiquam pro defensione propriæ injuriæ tuæ inferre denuo non præsumas. Nam si tale aliquid feceris, in te scias postea vindicandum.—Vid. Gratian. caus. xxiii. quæst. iv. c. xxvii.

Conc. Sardic. c. xiv. (in Latin. edit. xvii.) (Labb. vol. ii. p. 640.) "Ὅστις ἐπίσκοπος ἴπτι· τὸ δὲ πάντοτε μὲ πινὺν ἀποσιωπῆσαι οὐκ ὀφείλει· εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἀξέυχολος εὐρίσκειτο· ὅστις οὐκ ὀφείλει ἐν τοιοῦτῳ ἀνδρὶ πολιτεύεσθαι· καὶ ταχίως ἀντικρὺ πρεσβυτέρου ἢ διακόνου κινήσεις ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκκλησίας αὐτὸν ἰδιόησος προνοητίῳ ἰσθί, μὴ ἀβῶν [ἀβρόν] τὸν τοιοῦτον κατακρίνεσθαι, καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας ἀποστριβεῖσθαι· πάντες εἰρήκασιν· ὁ ἐκβαλλόμενος ἐχίτω ἱερούσαν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς μητροπόλεως τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας καταφυγεῖν· εἰ δὲ ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἀπίστη, ἐπὶ τὴν πλησιόχωρον κατατρέχιν, καὶ αἰεῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἀκριθείας αὐτοῦ ἐξιδάξῃται τὸ πρᾶγμα.

SECT. XVII. — *No Man to be Excommunicated for sins only in Design and Intention.*

It is also worth noting, that the Church inflicted the severe censures of excommunication upon men, only for overt acts, and not for sins in bare design and intention : because though these might be great sins before God, as our Saviour says, “ He that looks on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart ; ” yet the Church was no proper judge of the heart : and therefore she did not ordinarily punish such sins, till they made some visible appearance in the outward action. This seems to be the meaning of that canon of the Council of Neocæsarea, which says,^w “ If a man purpose in his heart to commit fornication with a woman, but his lust proceed not into action, it is apparent he is delivered by grace.” That is, he sins before God for his wicked design, but the Church inflicts not excommunication upon him, because his intention proceeds not to any outward act of uncleanness. So Zonaras^x interprets it among the ancients, and Osiander among the modern interpreters.^y Though some think that such intentions, if discovered by any overt acts, might bring a man under ecclesiastical censure.

SECT. XVIII. — *Nor for Forced or Involuntary Actions.*

The case is more clear as to all forced and involuntary actions, where the will was no way consenting to them. For as they were free from sin, so they were from punishment. There were some indeed, who, out of an overabundant zeal, and ignorant pretence of purity, were for

^w Conc. Neocæsar. c. iv. (Labbe. vol. i. p. 1481.) Ἐὰν προῆταιί τις ἐπιθυμῆσαι γυναῖκα, συγκαταβῆσαι μετ’ αὐτῆς, μὴ ἔλθῃ δὲ εἰς ἔργον αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐκθύμης φάινεται ὅτι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος ἠβύσθη.

^x Zonar. in c. xxxii. (apud Bever. tom. ii. p. 92.) Ἡ δὲ μίχρη τοῦ βουλεύσασθαι καὶ συγκαταβῆσαι, οὐ πρὸς θάνατον, δηλοῖται τὸν ψυχικόν· οὐ γὰρ πόντος ἂν κριθῇ ὁ προθύμης συγκαταβῆμινος, τῆς δὲ πρᾶξις ἀποσχόμενος· φησὶ γὰρ, ὁ τίταρτος πανὸν τῆς ἐν Νεωκαιοσαρείᾳ συνόδου, Ἐὰν προῆταιί τις ἐπιθυμῆσαι γυναῖκα, κ. τ. λ.

^y Osiand. in c. iv. Neocæs. edit. Witeberg. 1614. Hoc videtur velle hic canon, eum non cadere sub pœnam aliquam disciplinæ ecclesiasticæ.

excluding men from communion for such things, which were more to be reckoned their misfortunes than their crimes: but the Council of Ancyra prudently corrected this erroneous zeal by a canon to this purpose:² "That communion should not be denied to those who fled, but were apprehended or betrayed by their servants, and suffered loss of their estates, or torture, or imprisonment, declaring all the while that they were Christians; though they were held, and, by violence, the incense was put into their hands; and they were forced to receive meat offered to idols into their mouths, declaring themselves, all the time, to be Christians; and shewing, by their behaviour and habit, and humble course of life, that they were sorry for that which had happened; these, being without sin, are not to be debarred from communion. Or if, by the superabundant caution or ignorance of any, they have been debarred, let them forthwith be received into communion again." And the like is determined in the case of women that suffer ravishment against their wills, by Gregory Thaumaturgus,^a and St. Basil.^b And so by Dionysius of Alexandria,^c and Athanasius,^d and

² Conc. Ancy. c. iii. (Labb. vol. i. 1457.) Τοὺς φύγοντας καὶ συλληφθέντας, ἢ ὑπὸ οἰκίαν παραδοθέντας, ἢ ἄλλως τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀφαιρθέντας, ἢ ὑπομένοντας βασάνους, ἢ εἰς δισμωτήριον ἐμβληθέντας, βεβώντας τε ὅτι εἰσὶ Χριστιανοί, καὶ περισχυθέντας, ἥτοι εἰς τὰς χεῖρας πρὸς βίαν ἐμβαλλόντων τῶν βιαζομένων, ἢ βεβωμένους τε πρὸς ἀνάγκην διζαμένους, ὁμολογούντας δὲ διόλου, ὅτι εἰσὶ Χριστιανοί, καὶ τὸ πίνθος τοῦ συμβάντος αἰὶ ἐπιδικνουμένους τῇ πάσῃ καταστολῇ, καὶ τῇ σχήματι, καὶ τῇ τοῦ βίου ταπεινότητι τούτους, ὡς ἔξω ἁμαρτημάτων ὄντας, τῆς κοινοῦ μὴ κωλύσθας εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐκωλύθησαν ὑπὸ τινος, περισσοτέρας ἀκριβείας ἵκναι, εἰ καὶ σπαν ἀγνοίᾳ, ἐκτὸς προεδιχθῆναι.

^a Gregor. Thaum. c. i. Εἰ μὴν τοί τις ἐν ἄκρῃ σωφροσύνῃ ζήσας, καὶ καθαρός, καὶ ἔξω πάσης ὑπονοίας ἐπιδιδυγμένη βίῳ τὸν πρότερον νῦν περιπίπτων ἐκ βίας καὶ ἀνάγκης ὕβρις ἔχομεν παραδυγμα τὸ ἐν τῇ διανοητικῇ, τὸ ἐν τῇ νουνοίᾳ, ἢ ἐν τῇ πιδίᾳ ὕβρις ἄνθρωπος, ἢ βιασάμενος αὐτὴν, ἐκωλύθη μὴ αὐτῆς τῇ νουνοίᾳ, φρεσὶν, οὐ κοίτης οὐδὲν, κ. τ. λ.

^b Basil. c. xlix. (Labb. vol. ii. p. 1745.) Διὰ πρὸς ἀνάγκην γινόμενα φθορά, ἀνέκδοτοι ἴστωσαν ὡς καὶ ἡ δούλη, εἰ ἐξέσθη παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου διαπύτου, ἀνέκδοτος ἴστω.

^c Dionys. c. iv. Οἱ δ' ἐν ἀπρεσβίᾳ νουτιῇ ῥύσι γινόμενοι, καὶ οὗτοι τῇ ἰδίᾳ συνιδότι κατακαλοῦσιν, καὶ λαοὺς εἰς διακρίνονται περὶ τούτου, εἰτε μὴ, σκοπίσων.

^d Athanas. Epist. ad Ammum, ap. Bever. tom. ii. p. 36, d. Τότε μεμολύμεθα, ὅτι τὴν δυσωδιετῆτι ἁμαρτίαν ἐργαζόμεθα ὅτι δὲ φυσικὴ τις ἀβουλία ἐκρηκτοῦ γίνεσθαι, τότε τῇ τῆς φύσεως ἀνάγκῃ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων, ὡς προσιπομεν, καὶ τοῦτο ὑπομένομεν.

others, for any involuntary defilement whatsoever. These were the general measures observed by the ancients, to distinguish great and small offences, or innocence from sin, in order to shew what might or might not bring men under the censure of excommunication. But because it will contribute much toward the more exact understanding of the ancient discipline, to know more particularly the several sorts of those greater crimes for which men were subjected to the highest censures, I will now proceed to make a more distinct inquiry into the nature, and kinds, and degrees, of those high misdemeanours, in the following chapters.

END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY JAMES MOYER, CASTLE STREET, LEICESTER SQUARE.

